Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division SCB

Section 11128

Number

Of Justification:

FOUR DISPUTATIONS

Clearing and amicably Defending the Truth, against the unnecessary Oppositions of divers Learned and Reverend Brethren.

By Richard Baxter,

A servant of Christ for Truth and Peace.

JOHN 3.18,19.

He that Believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather then Light, because their deeds were evil.

Dr. *Twiss, Vindic. Grat. lib.* 1. *part.* 3. *pag.* (*Vol. min.*) 302.

[Verum in diverso genere ad Justitiam Dei refertur Christi satisfactio, & fides nostra: Christi satisfactio ad eandem refertur per modum, meriti & condignitatis: nostra vero fides ad eandem refertur duntaxat per modum congruæ dispositionis.]

LONDON,

Printed by *R. W.* for *Nevil Simmons* Bookseller in *Kederminster*, and are to be sold by him there; and by *Nathaniel Ekins*, at the Gun in *Pauls* Church-Yard. 1658.

Disputations

FOUR

DISPUTATIONS

Clearing and amicably Defending the
Truth against the unsettled Opi-
nions of divers Learned and Re-
verend Brethren.

By Richard Baxter,

A Lover of Truth for Truth and Peace.

The Preface.

Christian Readers,

TO prevent your trouble and misunderstanding in the perusal of these Disputations: I have two things here at the entrance to acquaint you with. First, The occasion of all these Writings: Secondly, The true state of the Controversies here managed. The first Disputation is upon a Question of considerable weight, whether Christ as Christ, and so as Prophet, Priest and King, be the Object of that Faith by which we are justified? Three points especially my Reverend Brother Mr. Blake was pleased to publish his Reasons against, which in my Aphorisms I had asserted. These being vindicated by me in an Apologie, he renewed the conflict in his Treatise of the Sacraments. The first

about the Sacraments I have defended again in a Volume by it self. The second is this in hand, which I had finished about fifteen or sixteen months ago. The third is about the Instrumental efficiency of Faith to our Justification, of which I had also begun above a twelve month since. But it hath lately pleased our wise and gracious Lord to call this Reverend Brother to himself: whereupon, though this first Disputation was gone so far, that I could not well recall it, yet the others, which was not out of my power, I resolved to condemn to perpetual silence. If you ask me a reason of this resolution, I must desire that my disposition and passion may go for part of a Reason this once. The grief of my heart for the loss of this precious servant of Christ would not permit me to appear any further in a way that seemed to militate with the dead, and with one whose death, we have all so much cause to lament. Alas, that our sin should provoke our dear Father, to put out the precious Lights of his Sanctuary, and to call in such experienced faithful Labourers, while ignorance, and error, and prophaness, and all Vice doth so plenteously survive. When these plants of Hell do thrive upon us, under all our care to weed them up: what will they do when the Vineyard is left desolate? Though God in mercy is raising up a supply of young ones, that may come to be Pillars in their dayes: yet alas, what difference will the Church find between these, and their grave experienced Guides: and how many years study, and experience, and patience, is necessary to ripen these tender plants, to bring them to the stature, and stability, and strength of such as this Blessed servant of Christ, that is now taken from us. The sense of our loss doth make it doubly bitter to my thoughts, that ever I was unhappily engaged in any way of serving the Lord of Truth, which must con-

tein

tein ſo much contradiction of ſuch a friend of Truth. As it is for God, or for Truth, or for the uſe of the Church, I dare not diſown it; but as it ſavoureth of diſagreement (though neceſsitated to it) it is very ungrateful to me to think of, or review. But our diſeaſes will have their pains. We muſt bear the ſmites of our own and our Brethrens weakneſſes, rather then neglect the ſervice of Chriſt, his Church and Truth. We quickly pardon one another, and at the furtheſt Heaven agreeth us all: But the benefit of our ſearch, though mixed with our infirmities, may be ſomewhat ſerviceable when we are gone.

The ſecond Diſputation is yet more ungrateful to me, then the firſt: the Reverend Brother whom I contradict being as high and dear in my eſteem as moſt men alive; indeed being an Honour and Bleſſing to the Church in this unworthy Generation. The Lord preſerve him long for his ſervice. But my Defence here alſo is neceſsitated. 1. *I did my beſt to have prevented the Neceſsity, and could not: I mean, not by diſwading him from oppoſing me in Print, for that might have hindered the Church of the Benefit of his Oppoſition (for ought I knew, till I had ſeen it:) But by trying firſt, whether I could receive or give ſatisfaction.* 2. *I had publickly obliged my ſelf, if this Reverend Brother did Diſſent, to ſearch again: and by an Epiſtle, became more accountable to the world for Diſſenting from him then other men.* 3. *His Name deſervedly precious in the Church, hath the greater advantage to over-lay the Truth, where humane imperfection engageth him againſt it. Yet do I not blame him for beginning this Conteſt with me; but take the blame to my ſelf that might occaſion it, by diſhonouring his Name by a temeracious prefixing it to my undigeſted Papers,*

(though

(though nothing but High estimation, and Affection was my Motive.)

The Letters that past between us were never intended for the view of the world: And therefore I must desire the Reader to remember it, if sometime I be more pressing and vehement, then manners and reverence require; because we use to speak freelier in private among friends, then in the hearing of the world. And yet I thought it my duty now to joyn them with the rest for these Reasons. 1. *Because some passages in the Writings of this Reverend Brother, do in a manner invite me to it.* 2. *Because the matter requireth me to speak the same things; and therefore it is as good affix the old, as be at the same labour needlesly again.* 3. *And it can be no wrong to him, because it is my own Papers that are the main bulk of what I publish: His Letters being brief, and annexed but as the occasions of mine.* 4. *But especially, I was brought to think it meet, by the open blame that I have received from some very dear and Reverend Brethren, for not preventing this publike Conteſt. And therefore I thought good to let them see, that I was not wholly wanting to prevent it.*

If there be any passages in these Writings too eager or provoking (which I must needs suspect even where I have not observed them, as being conscious of too keen a stile, forgetting the persons while I speak meerly to the words and matter,) I do intreat my Brethren to pardon it, as being not designed to their provocation or dishonour, and as I heartily do the like by theirs, and as I hope God will do both theirs and mine. And I do adjure the Reader to believe that this Controversie: for all our infirmities is managed with a very high esteem and honour of those Reverend Brethren, whom I am necessitated to gainsay. Nor

would

would I have it be any dishonour to them (though an excuse to me,) that they have been the Assailants, and begun the conflict: for the Truths of God must be precious to us all, and I doubt not but they were confident that it was some dangerous errour, which they set upon, and I have here proved to be the Truth. Nor is it any such wrong to either side, to be openly contradicted, that Reasons may be openly produced, and men may have some further help, to see into these Points. Let the proud swell or smart, because they are thus proclaimed fallible, and mistaken; but the Humble that are devoted servants to the Truth, are of another spirit, and have learnt another lesson.

And if any Papist or enemy to our unity and Peace shall from these Writings predicate our dissentions or divisions, let them know to their faces, that even these differences as momentous as they seem, are not neer so great as are commonly published among themselves: nor are they for Number one to twenty, perhaps to a hundred, that are agitated in their Schooles, and the writings of their Doctors: Had we such differences as those of the Jesuit Casuists *opened by* Montaltas *the* Jansenian *in his Mysterie of* Jesuitism, *out of their own writings, something they might then say against us. Yea I doubt not but we differ with more hearty Christian Love, then they agree; and have more real union in our controversies, then they have in their Articles of Faith, and are neerer one another in our smaller differences, then the* French *and* Italians *are in their very Fundamentals.*

The third Disputation was called forth by Mr. Warner's *Treatise of the* Object and Office of Faith, *and takes up the subject of the first Disputation, with some others.*

When that was in the Press, Mr. Tombes's *Book against* Infant Baptism *came forth, in which I found the Pa-*

pers that I sent to him (upon his importunity) printed without my consent, (which if God will, I shall yet vindicate.) And therefore seeing that it is his way, I thought he might do the like by other Papers, which formerly I had wrote to him on this subject of Justification. And therefore thinking it fitter that I should publish them (of the two) then he, (I have saved him the charge of printing them, and annexed them to these.

The fourth Disputation was added, because it is the very heart of our Controversie, which most of our Disputes about the instrumentall Causality of Faith as to Justification, and the other Concomitant, are resolved into.

That the Reader may understand these Disputations the better, I shall here at the entrance shew him the face of the way that I maintain, and also of the way that I oppose.

The way that I plead for is contained in these Propositions. 1. *Man having broken the Law of Nature or works, is lost, and disabled to his own Recovery, or to do any works by which that Law will ever justifie him.*

2. *Jesus Christ hath Redeemed him from this lost condition, by his Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection, &c. fulfilling the Law by his obedience, and suffering for our not fulfilling it, and thereby satisfying the Lawgiver, and attaining the ends of the Law, and more: making himself an example to us of holiness, and becoming our Teacher, High Priest and King, to save us from all sin and enemies, and recover us to God, for our Salvation, and his Glory and Pleasure.*

3. *The Offices and Works of Christ, are for other ends as well as for our justification; even for our Sanctification, Glorification, &c.*

4. *The Believer ought not to confound the offices, works,*

or

or ends and effects, but to apprehend them as distinctly as he can.

5. *The same Offices of Christ are exercised in the effecting several works: He doth justifie us both as Priest, Prophet and King: and he sanctifieth us as Priest, Prophet and King, His Death purchasing both our justification and sanctification; and his Teaching shewing us the way to both, and his Kingly Office conferring both, though most notably our justification; and the Prophetical effecting more of our sanctification, then of our justification.*

6, *We must have part in Christ himself as our Head, in order of Nature before we can partake of justification, Sanctification, (as following our first faith) or Glorification from him.*

7. *Though our Physical Communion with Christ is effected by a Physical change on the soul; yet our Right to him and to Justification, and other following benefits is the effect of a free Gift, or Testament, or Promise, and that Promise or free Gift is our Title, which is* Fundamentum juris, *or the efficient Instrumental cause.*

8. *Christ and pardon, or justification, and Right to Heaven,* &c. *are given us by one and the same Deed of Gift: so that he that hath Right to Christ, hath by the same Title & on the same terms Right to these his benefits.*

9. *This Promise or Gift is conditional; though it be but the Condition of a free Gift that is required.*

10. *No mans works, Repentance or Faith is his proper Title to pardon or life, nor any proper meritorious cause of it; nor any efficient, Principal or Instrumental causes of his Right; No act of ours can be more then a meer condition of that Right; and a* Causa sine quâ non (*which, as it is an act that's pleasing to God, and hath the Promise of a Reward, the Fathers called improperly by the Name*

of Merit, which yet less fitly agrees to the Condition of our first Justification then of our Glorification.)

11. *Christs pardon and life are given by this Gospel-Promise on condition of our faith in Christ, that is, if we become Believers in Christ; or Christians; which is, If we accept of Christ as offered in the Gospel, and that is, to bring us from our sins and selves to God, by the acts of his Teaching, Priestly, and Kingly Office; Or, if we believe in Christ as Christ. So that it is not any one single act of Faith that is the condition of Justification: nor are the several Benefits of Christ given us on condition of several acts of Faith; as if we had Right to pardon by one act, and to Christ himself by another, and to Adoption by another; and to Heaven by another, &c. Nor have the several acts of our faith as divided an Interest in procurement of the Benefits as Christs actions had: But it is one and the same entire faith in Christ as Christ, that is the condition of all these consequent special Benefits; without division in the procurement. So that the Belief in Christ as our Teacher and King hath as much hand in our Justification, as believing in him as Priest; it being the backwardness of nature to the acceptance of Christs Government and Doctrine, that is a special Reason why faith is made the condition of that pardon, which Nature is not so backward to accept.*

12. *The Reasons to be assigned, why faith in Christ is made the condition of Justification, is,* 1. *The will of the free Donor.* 2. *The fitness of faith to that Office; as being suited to Gods Ends, and to Christ the Object, and to mans necessitous estate. Not only because it is the Receiving of Righteousness, but for all these Reasons together, in which its aptitude doth consist; and its Aptitude to the Honour of the Redeemer and free Justifier is*

the

the principal part of its Aptitude : it being impoſſible that God ſhould prefer man as his ultimate end before himſelf.

13. *Though the Reaſon why Faith is made by God the condition of our Juſtification, muſt partly be fetcht from the Nature of Faith, which ſome call its Inſtrumentallity in apprehending Chriſt, yet the Reaſon why we are* Juſtified *by Faith, muſt be fetched from the Tenour of the Promiſe and Will of the Promiſer. So that though the Remote Reaſon be that Aptitude of Faith, which is the* Diſpoſitio materiæ; *yet the formal neereſt Reaſon is, becauſe God hath made it the condition of the Gift, which ſhall ſuſpend the efficacy till performed, and when performed, the benefit ſhall be ours.*

14. *As Faith hath its denemination from ſome one or few acts, which yet ſuppoſe many as concomitant and conſequent : So thoſe concomitant and conſequent Acts have their anſwerable place and Intereſt in the foreſaid Conditionality, as to our part in Chriſt and Juſtification.*

15. *And therefore it was not the Apoſtles meaning to ſet Faith againſt theſe concomitant acts, (as Repentance, hope in Chriſt, deſire of Chriſt, love to Chriſt,* &c.) *and to exclude theſe under the notion of Works : but contrarily to ſuppoſe them in their order.*

16. *The burdenſome works of the* Moſaical *Law, ſuppoſed to be ſuch as from the dignity and perfection of that Law, would juſtifie men by procuring pardon of ſin, and acceptance with God, are they that the* Jews *oppoſed to Chriſts Righteouſneſs and Juſtification by Faith, and which* Paul *diſputeth againſt, and conſequently againſt any works, or acts, or habits of our own, oppoſed to Chriſt, or this way of free juſtification by him.*

17. *The not loosing our Iustification and Title to Christ and Life, hath more for its condition, then the first Reception or Possession hath. And so hath the final Iustification at judgement, if men live after their first believing.*

18. *Iustification at judgement, being the Adjudging us to Glory, hath the same conditions as Glorification it self hath.*

Reader, In these Eighteen Propositions, thou mayst fully see the Doctrine that I contend for, which also in my Confession, Apologie, and this Book I have expressed.

And now I will shew you somewhat of the face of the Doctrine, which the Dissenters commonly do propugne, but not so largely, because I cannot open other mens Doctrine so freely and fully as I can do my own.

1. *They agree with me that Christs Righteousness is the meritorious or material cause of our Iustification, though some add that it is the formal cause, I suppose it is but a mistaken name.*

2. *They agree that Christ, and pardon, and Life, are Given us by the Gospel-Promise.*

3. *They yield that an entire Faith in Christ as Christ, is the condition of our Right to his entire Benefits.*

4. *But they say that the Acts of Faith in their procurement of the Benefits, have as divers an Interest as the Acts of Christ, which Faith believeth.*

5. *And they say, that it is some one act (or two, or some of them) that is the sole justifying act, though others be compresent.*

6. *This*

6. *This Iustifying act some call the Apprehending of Christ as a Sacrifice: some Affiance, or Recumbency, or Resting on him, as a Sacrifice for sin, or as others, also on his active Righteousnes; or an Apprehension of Christs Righteousnes; or as others, A perswasion that his Promise is true; or an Assent to that truth; or as others, an Assurance, or at least a Belief,* fide Divinâ; *that we are justified.*

7. *They say, that the neerest Reason of our Iustification by this faith is, because it is an Instrument of our Iustification, or of our Apprehending Christs Righteousnes: And so, that we are justified by Faith as an Instrumental efficient cause; say some: and as a Passive Receiving Instrument, say others.*

8. *They say, that there being but two wayes of Iustification imaginable, by faith, or by works; all that desert the former way (if they despair not of Iustification) fall under the expectation of the latter: And I grant that Scripture mentioneth no third way.*

9. *Therefore say they, seeing that* Pauls *Iustification by Faith, is but by the act before mentioned: whoever looketh to be justified, in whole, or in part, by another act (as by Faith in Christ as Teacher, as King, by desiring him, by Hoping in him, by Loving him, by disclaiming all our own righteousnes,* &c.) *doth seek Iustification by Works which* Paul *disputes against, and so set against the only true Iustification by Faith.*

10. *Yea, and they hold, that whoever looks to be Iustified by that act of faith, which themselves call the Iustifying act, under any other notion then as an Instrument, doth fall to justification by works, or turn from the true Iustification by Faith.*

By these unwarrantable Definitions, and Distinctions,

and

and additions to Gods Word; A lamentable perplexity is prepared for mens souls; it being not possible for any living man to know, that he just hits on the justifying Act, and which is it, and that he takes in no more, &c. and so that he is not a Legalist, or Jew, *and falls not from Evangelical Iustification by faith in Christ. So that Iustification by faith in Christ as Christ, (considered in all essential to his Office,) is with them no Iustification by faith in Christ, but justification by Works, so much disowned by the Apostle, the expectants of which are so much condemned. I have gathered the sum of most of the Dissenters minds as far as I can understand it. If any particular man of them, disown any of this, let him better tell you his own mind: For I intend not to charge him with any thing that he disowns. The Lord Illuminate and Reconcile all his people, by his Spirit and Truth.* Amen.

The

The CONTETS.

Disputation I.

Queſt. *WHether we are juſtified by believing in Jeſus Chriſt as our King and Teacher, as well as by believing in his blood?* *Aff.* pag 1.

The ſtate and weight of the Controverſie. p.2, *&c.*
Ten Propoſitions for fuller explication. p.10, *&c.*
Argument *firſt.* p.13
Argu. 2. p. 14
Argu. 3. p.19
Argu.4. p. 24
Argu. 5. p.27
Argu. 6. p.28
Argu.7. p.30
Argu.8. p.31
Argu.9. p.35
Argu.10. p.38
defended againſt Mr. Blak's *aſſault.* p.40
Whether *the Law of Grace condemn any, and how.* p.44.45
The Diſtinction of fides quæ juſtificat, *&* quâ juſtificat *conſidered.* p.46, *&c.*

Mr. Blak's *first Argument answered.* p.53
Argument 2. *answered.* p.55
Argument 3. p.57
Argument 4. p.63
Argument 5. *and* 6. p.64

Disputation 2.

Quest. *WHether Works are a condition of condition of Justification, and so whether we are justified by works as such a condition?*
The terms [*Works and Justification*] *explained.* p.70,71
The Term Condition *explained.* p.72
The Truth laid down in several Propositions. p.75
Negative and Affirmative
The main Proposition proved. p.79, *&c.*
Quest. *Can Christ be Instrumental in justifying.* p.84
Quest. *Did Christ expiate the sins, that by the Gospel men are obliged to punishment for?* p.86
Of Repentance, and the habit of Faith in Justification. p.85, 86
Quest. *Doth the Gospel justifie us?* p.86,87,88,89
Other points briefly discussed. p.90
The Opponents stating of the Question. p.94,95,96
Divers unjust charges repelled. p.97.to 101
The Opponents Thesis *and Arguments.* p.101,102
How Abraham *was justified, debated to* p.110
All Works make not the Reward to be not of Grace, proved by six Arguments. p.111,to 115. *And by Expositors.* p.115,*&c.*
His second Argument from the difference put between faith and other Graces in Justification. p.118
The case of faiths Interest opened by a similitude. p.120
His third Argument considered: Our first Justification how diffe-

different from the following. p.122,123
His fourth Argument of self Righteousness and causal conditions. p.124,&c.
His Fifth Argument, Works are the fruits, therefore not the condition. p.128
His sixth Argument. p.132
His seventh Argument. Of a twofold Righteousness or Justification. p 133
His eight Argument that cannot be a condition of Justification, which it self needeth Justification. p.136
Answered.
Paul *judgeth them dung.* p.140
How justifying faith belongs to the Law, and the difference between the Law and Gospel. p142
More of Christs suffering for the violation of the new Covenant. p.146
His ninth Argument, we fill men with doubts. p.147
Answered.
His tenth Argument. p.149
Of the reconciling of Paul *and* James. p 150.&c.
Letters that past between this Reverind Brother and me. p.157
In which is discussed the Argument from Abrahams *Justification. And in the last Letter these questions.*
1. *Whether* videre, audire, *be only Grammatical actions, and Physical Passions.* p.194,&c
2. *Whether Believing be only so, and* credere *only* pati. p 198
3. *Whether Faith be passive in its Instrumentality:* p 207
4. *Whether the Opponents Way make not other Graces as proper Instruments of Justification:* p.211
5. *Whether Faith be a proper Instrument of Justification.* p.212
6. *Question. If Faith be an Instrument, whether it justifie primarily and proxime as such, or as an apprehension of Christ or Righteousness.* p.214
7. *Question, which is the more clear, safe and certain Doctrine.* p.220
Repentance, whether excluded. p.227

Of Faith relatively taken. p.228
Of the Assemblies Definition of faith. p.230
The Judgement of some Divines. p.233, &c
whether a dying man may look on his own Acts as the Conditions of the Covenant performed. p.241, &c.
Further Explications. p.244. &c.

Disputation 3.

Quest. WHether Besides the Righteousness of Christ imputed, there be a personal evangelical Righteousness necessary to Justification and Salvation? Affir. p.259
Distinctions and Propositions Negative and Affirmative for explication. p.260, &c
Proved. p.266
Objections answered. p.269, &c.
Mr. Warner's *Arguments confuted.* p.273 *to* 285
Mr. Warner's 13th *chap. confuted about Justification, and the Interest of Obedience,* &c. p.286
Master Warner's *Arguments answered, by which he would exclude Christ as King,* &c. *from being the Object of justifying faith.* p.293. &c.
The other chief passages in his Book considered. p.305, &c.
His distinction of fides quæ & qua. p.308, &c.
His Preface answered in an Epistle. p.313.

MR. John Tombe's, *his friendly Animadversions on my Aphorisms, with a Discussion of them.* p.322
Justification in Law-title by the Promise fully vindicated. p.332, *&c.*
Whether Justification be a continued Act, or but one Act. p.341 &c.
Whether Faith comprize Love, Subjection or other Graces: at large. p.345. &c.
Whether Faith be only in the Intellect, or also in the Will. p.354, &c.
Justifying Faith receiveth Christ as Lord, &c. p.358
It is Faith, and not only Love, or other Graces, by which the Will receiveth Christ. p.361, &c.
The Gospel is a Law. p.369, &c.
Repentance necessary to Justification. p.370, &c.
How Faith justifieth. p.377
Whether Christ had a Title on Earth to Rule. p.379
Of Christs universal Dominion and Redemption. p.380
More of the Justification by the Gospel-Promise. p.384
Of Preparatives to Justification. p.387
What Paul *excludeth as opposite to faith in Justification.* p.391, 392
Of Intercision, of Justification, and the guilt of particular sins. p.393, *&c.*

Disputation 4.

Quest. WHether *the Faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification, be one only Physical Act of the Soul? Or, Whether all Humane Acts, except one Physical Act of Faith, be the works which* Paul *excludeth from Justification?* Neg. p.399
The Question opened: and its proved that this Faith is not one only.

ly Act. 1. *Either Numerically.* 2. *Or of an inferior Genus, so as to be of one only Faculty : Nor only God the Father, Christ, Promise, Pardon, Heaven, &c. the Object.* 3. *Nor in* specie specielissima, *proved by many Arguments.*

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAge 6. *line* 23. read *that I.* p. 13. *l.* 10. r. *quæ Christum.* p. 14. *l.* 9. r. *promitentiæ.* l. 27. r. *hath.* p. 18. *l.* 3. r. *as this.* l. 34. r. *proof of.* p 19. *l.* 24. r. *be the.* l. 34. r. *&.* p. 21. l. 17. r. *that he u.* p. 24. *l.* 35. r. *thus.* p. 29 *l.* 13. r. *though.* p. 32. *l.* 32 r. *must be* p. 39. *l.* 6. r. *with.* p. 44. *l.* 1. r. *I need.* p. 45. *l.* 30. r. *Commination.* p. 52. *l.* 11. r. *as.* p. 55. *l* 26. r. *nostri.* l. 32. r. *exclusion.* p. 64. *l.* 30. r. *Curse.* p. 74. *l.* 8. r. *capitibus.* p. 81. *l.* 13. r. *no.* l. 20. r. *Ad.* p. 85. *l.* 6. *blot out against.* p. 87. *l.* 22. r. *that is.* l. 21. r. *execution.* p. 88. *l.* 12. read *there.* p. 94. *l.* 10. r. *notion.* p. 95. *l.* 3. r. *is.* l. 9. r. *your.* p. 99. *l.* 19. r. *as mediate it.* p. 119. *l.* 36. r. *as.* p. 135. *l.* 5. r. *that he hath not.* p. 136. *l.* 18. r *Christ.* p. 139 *l.* 13. r. *a means.* page 152. *l* 17. r. *been.* p. 166 *l.* 38. r. *we may.* p. 168. r. *Gods.* p. 170 *l.* 17. r. *signs.* p. 175. *l.* 15. r. *divers.* p. 178. *l.* 19. r. *he that works not.* p. 180. *l.* 4. r. *or.* p. 183. *l.* 19. r. *casuals.* p. 186. *l.* 25. r. *sensu.* p. 197. *l.* 29. r. *Potentia.* p. 208. *l.* 8. r. *Porret.* l. 31. r. *Passive in.* p. 210 *l* 24. r. *mediante.* p. 212. *l.* 12. r. *except.* p. 233. *l.* 7. r. *in the.* p. 243. l 32. blot out *till.* p. 252. *l.* 13. r. *veritatis.* p. 257. *l.* 14. r. *exalted.* p. 271. *l.* 10. r. *righteous.* p. 286. *l.* 17. r. *he.* l. 24. r. *the.* p. 290. *l.* 1. r. *marks.* p. 294. *l.* 22. and *l.* 26. and *p.* 265. *l.* 23. and 26. for. *quæ* r. *quâ.* p. 299. *l.* 1. r. *unproved* p. 314. *l.* 36. r. *cull.* p 319. *l.* 14. r. *that is.* p. 320. *l.* 14 r. *fur.* p. 326. *l.* 31. r. *fruit.* p. 354. *l.* ult. r. *promotione.* p 360. *l.* 17. r. *God.* p. 361. *l.* 32. r. *thought.* p. 386. *l.* 27. r. *Is it not.* p. 387. *l.* 32. r. *sanctification.* p. 390. *l.* 22. r. *morally.* p. 398. *l.* 15. r. *probable.* l. 23 r. *Impenitency.*

Queſt. *Whether we are Juſtified by Beliveing in Jeſus Chriſt, as our King and Teacher; as well as by believing in his Blood?* Aff.

THough I have oft ſpoken to this Queſtion in the ears of the world, as taking it to be of very great Conſequence; yet upon the Invitation of this opportunity, I ſhall once again attempt a brief Diſcuſſion of it; and the rather, becauſe the Anſwers of a Reverend Brother (Mr. *Blake*) to my former Arguments, and his Arguments for the contrary opinion, may wrong the Truth and the ſouls of men, if their Fallacy be not manifeſted by a Reply.

And I ſhall firſt ſpeak ſomewhat of the Importance of the Queſtion, and then of the ſenſe of it, and then endeavour a

clear Resolution, and the Confirmation thereof, and the Confutation of the contrary conceits.

And for the first, I shall give you my thoughts of it in these two Propositions.

Proposition 1. The difference amongst Protestants about this Question is not of so great moment, that either party must *Eo nomine* be judged to deny the Essentials (or Fundamentals) of the faith, and so to be of a different Religion from the other, or to fall short of Salvation.

I lay down this Proposition first, Because of the Papists who stand looking upon all our differences with a mind too like the mind of the Devil; rejoycing in them, and endeavouring to encrease them, and to make them seem greater in the eyes of the world, than indeed they are, that so they may make use of them for the reproaching of our Profession, and take an advantage from them to make the truth and Servants of Christ become odious unto others.

Secondly, And I do it also for the sake of some (even too many) among our selves, that speak of controversies as they are concerned in them, or as the party to whom they joyn doth speak of them, or as they appear to them in the dark, or at a distance, or upon a hasty superficial search; but have not the skil (nor some of them, the will) to open the true state of a Controversie, and make the difference appear no wider, then indeed it is.

To the proving of the Proposition, it must be observed, First, that the Affirmers do yield, that it is not the Doctrine or Government of Christ, but his blood that is the Ransome for our sins, and his Righteousnes that is the sole Meritorious Cause of our Justification: and that believing in Christ as Prophet and King, is not a proper Instrument of our Justification; and that Christ as a Ransome for us, and a deserver of our Justification, is the formal Object of that other act (which accordingly believeth in him,) and not of this act of believing in him as Prophet and King.

On the other side, it is granted by them that are for the Negative, that it is our duty to believe in Christ as a Prophet and King and that it is of necessity to salvation, yea to Justification it self; For they yield that it is the *Fides quæ Justificat*, the faith by

by which we are Justified; but not *quâ Justificat*, or that it Justifieth not *quâ talis*, as such: They yield also that it is a Condition of Justification, for so they confess that Repentance it self is; but they only say, that it is not the Instrument of Justification, as they think the other act is. So that the difference is here: They yield all that we affirm (if I can understand them;) but they affirm somewhat more themselves, which we do not yield: They grant that believing in Christ as our Teacher and Lord is a Condition of our Justification, and the *fides quæ Justificat*; which is all that I desire: But then they add, that the Belief in Christs blood and Righteousness is the Instrument of our Justification, and that it justifieth *quâ talis*; which we utterly deny, if the words be properly taken; and *Tropes* should not upon choice be made the terms of our Question, while there are plainer to be had. So that by this time its easie to see that neither of these opinions are such as must unchurch or damn us, or make us Hereticks. First, We that are for the Affirmative are out of that danger; for we hold no more positively then is yielded us by the other. All that they can charge us with, is this Negative, that [believing in Christs blood doth not properly Justifie as an Instrument, (that is, as an efficient Instrumental Cause of our Justification) nor yet *quâ talis*:] And I think they will not lay our salvation on the Affirmative, when they consider what we yield (of which more anon) And on the other side, we are far from passing any damning sentence on them that are for the said Instrumentality; especially as we perceive it commonly held. Let no Papist therefore insult over us and say, we are disagreed in our fundamentals, unless he be resolved to do it in design against the light of his own conscience. I the rather premise this Caution, because I hear that the Papists do mutter thus against us already to silly people that cannot see their deceit: They say, [Is not the death of Christ a fundamental? and yet some say that he died for All, and some say he died only for the Elect; some say he paid the *Idem*, and some but the *Tantundem*] but they tell not the people the true state of the Controversie, and wherein we are agreed, or that they differ as much about the extent of the death of Christ among themselves, without such a charge. Christ is the Foundation: but yet whe-

ther his hair were cut, or not, or whether he were thirty three or thirty five, or fifty years old when he died; or whether he was buried in a Garden, or in a Sepulchre of ſtone, theſe are not the foundation. So much to the firſt Propoſition for narrowing our difference.

Propoſition 2. Though this controverſie be not of ſuch Moment as is denied, yet is it of great weight, and the Conſequents of the Errors of one party hereabout, are ſuch, as if they were held practically and after the proper ſenſe of their expreſsions, would be a great hinderance to ſalvation, if not plainly hazard it. And therefore the queſtion is not to be caſt by, as needleſs or unprofitable. It is ſo neer the great matters of our Redemption, Juſtification, and the nature of faith, that it is it ſelf the greater. And if *Ameſius* ſay true, that truths are ſo concatenated, that every Error muſt by conſequence overthrow the foundation, then it muſt be ſo in this. The conſequents ſhall be mentioned anon in the Arguments, where it will be more ſeaſonable. And in great matters, it is not a contemptible Error which conſiſteth but in miſ-naming and miſ-placing them: It is a very great help to the clear and full underſtanding of Truths, to have right Notions and Methods. And the contrary may prove dangerous to many others, when the particular Patrons of thoſe miſtakes may be in no danger by them. For perhaps their firſt Notions may be righter than their ſecond; and they may not ſee the conſequents of their miſtakes; and yet when ſuch miſtakes in terms and methods ſhall be commended to the world, other men that hear and read their words, and know not their hearts and better apprehenſions, are like enough to take them in the moſt obvious or proper ſenſe, and by one diſorder to be led to more, and to ſwallow the Conſequents as well as the miſleading Premiſes. And therefore I muſt needs ſay, that this point appeareth of ſuch moment in my eyes, that I dare not deſert that which I confidently take to be the Truth, nor ſacrifice it to the honor or pleaſure of man.

For the explication of the terms it is needleſs to ſay much, and I have neither time for, nor mind of needleſs work. By [*Juſtification*] here we mean not either Sanctification alone, or ſanctification and remiſſion conjunct as making up our Righteouſneſs,

as

as the Papists do: (though we deny not but sometime the word may be found in Scripture in some such sense:) For thus it is past controversie, that our justification, that is, our sanctification as to all that followeth faith, is as much, if not much more, from our belief in Christ as Teacher and King, as from our belief in him as a Ransome. But by Justification we mean that Relative Change which Protestants ordinarily mean by this word; which we need not here define.

The Prepositon [*By*] (when we speak of being justified by faith) is not by all men taken in the same sense. First, Sometime its used more strictly and limitedly to signifie only an efficiency, or the Interest of an Efficient cause. And thus some Divines do seem to take it, when they say that we are justified by faith in Christs blood and Righteousness, and not by faith in him as a Teacher or a Lord: which occasioneth the Papists to say our difference is wider then indeed it is: For the word [*By*] hath an ambiguity; and in their sence, we yield their Negative though not their Affirmative, in the last-mentioned conclusion. Secondly, Sometime the word [*By*] is used to signifie a Conditionality, or the Interest of a condition only in special. And thus we take it when we explain our selves in what manner it is that we are justified by faith, and by these questioned acts in particular. And therefore those Protestants that dispute against us who are for the Affirmative, do (if I understand them) deny only the propriety of the phrase which we use, but not the thing or sense which we express by it; for they grant that these acts of faith are Conditions of our Justification, when they have never so much disputed, that we are not justified by them, and so a small syllable of two letters, is much of the matter of their controversie.

Thirdly, sometime this word is used to signifie the Interest of any other cause as well as the Efficient and that either generally, or especially of some one. This Paper is white *By* the whiteness as the formal cause: we are moved to a godly life *By* God and salvation as the final cause *&c.*

Fourthly, Sometime the term [*By*] is taken yet more largely (and fitly enough) for all or any *Means* in General, or the interest of any means in the attainment of the End. And

so it comprehendeth all Causes, even those *Per accidens* and Conditions as well as Causes, an all that doth but remove impediments. And in this comprehensive sense we take it here in the Question, though when we come to determine what is the special Interest of faith in Justification, I take it in the second sense.

Take notice also, That I purposely here use this phrase [we are Justified by Believing, or by Faith] rather than these, [justifying faith] or [Faith doth justifie us.] And I here foretell you, that if I shall at any time use these last expressions, as led to it by those with whom I deal, it is but in the sense as is hereafter explained. The Reasons why I choose to stick to this phrase, rather then other, are; First, Because this only is the Scripture phrase, and the other is not found in Scripture; (that I remember) It is never said, that [Faith doth justifie us] though it be said that [we are justified by faith.] And if any will affirm, that I may use that phrase which is not found in Scripture, he cannot say, I must use it. And in a Controverted case, especially about such Evangelical truths, the safety of adhering to Scripture phrase, and the danger of departing from it is so discernable, (and specially when men make great use of their unscriptural phrases for the countenancing of their opinions,) I have the more reason to be cautelous. Secondly, Because the phrases are not alwaies of one and the same signification. The one is more comprehensive then the other, if strictly taken. To be justified by faith] is a phrase extensive to the Interest of any Medium whatsoever: And there are Media which are not Causes. But when we say that [Faith doth justifie us] or call it [justifying Faith] we express a Causality, if we take the word strictly. Though this last phrase may signifie the Interest of a bare Condition, yet not so properly and without straining as the former. The Reverend Author of the seond Treatise of Justification, is of the same mind as to the use of the terms, but he conjectures another reason for the Scripture use, then I shall ever be perswaded of, *viz.* that it is because *Credere* is not *Agere*, but *Pati*; to *Believe* is to *Suffer*, and not to *Act*: that it is a *Grammaticall Action*, but *Physically a Passion*. Though I think this no truer, then

then that my brains are made of a looking glass, and my heart of marble; yet is there somwhat in this Reverend mans opinion, that looks toward the truth afar off. For indeed it intimateth that as to Causality or Efficiency; faith is not Active in the justifying of a sinner, but is a meer condition or moral disposition, which is necessary to him that will be in the neareſt Capacity to be justifyed by God.

The last words, [*Believing in his blood*] I use not as the only way that is taken by the Opponents; but as one instance among divers. For they use to expres themselves so variously, as may cause us to think by many (as we know it of some) that they take more waies then one in opposing us. First, Some of them say, that the only Act of faith that justifieth, is our believing in Christs blood, or sufferings, or humiliation. Secondly, Others say, That it is the believing in, or apprehending, and resting on his whole Righteousnes, even his Obedience as Obedience, to be it self imputed to us. Thirdly, Other Reverend Divines say, that it is the apprehending and resting on his Habitual, as well as Active and Passive Righteousnes; that his Habits may be imputed to us, as our Habitual Righteousnes, and his Acts as our active Righteousnes; in both which together we are reputed perfect Fulfillers of the Law; and his sufferings as our Satisfaction for our breaking the Law. As for those that mention the Imputation of his Divine Righteousnes to us, they are so few, and those for the most part suspected of unsoundnes, that I will not number it among the Opinions of Protestants. Fourthly, Others say, that the justifying Act of Faith is not the apprehension of Christs Righteousnes or Ransome; but of his Person, and that only as he is Priest, and not as Prophet or King. Fifthly, Others think that it is the apprehension of Christs person, but not in his intire Priestly office; for he performeth some Acts of his Priestly office for us (Intercession) after we are justified: Therefore it is his Person only as the Satisfier of justice, and Meritor of Life, which they make the adequate Object of the justifying Act of Faith. Sixthly, Others say, that it is both his Person and his satisfaction, Merit, Righteousnes, yea, Pardon and justification it self, that is the adequate Object: By which they must

must needs grant that it is not one only single Act, but many. Seventhly. One Reverend man thats now with God (Bishop *Usher*) understanding that I was engaged in this Controversie, did of his own accord acquaint me with his Judgement, as tending to reconciliation: And because I never heard any other of the same mind, and it hath a considerable aspect, I shall briefly and truly report it as he expressed it. He told me, that there are two Acts (or sort of Acts) of Faith. By the first we receive the *Person* of Christ, as a woman in Marriage doth first receive the *Person* of her Husband. This is our Implantation into Christ the true Vine, and gives us that Union with him, which must go before Communion and Communication of his Graces, and so before justification. The second of Faiths Acts are those that apprehend the Benefits which he offereth; Of which Justification is one, and this is strictly the *Justifying* Act of Faith, and followeth the former. So that (said he) it is true that the first Act which apprehendeth Christs person doth take him as King, Priest, and Prophet, as Head and Husband, that we may be united to him: but the following acts which Receive his Benefits do not so, but are suited to the several benefits.]

The opinion is subtile, and I perceived by his Readiness in it, that it was one of his old studied points, and that he had been long of that mind; my answer to him was this: [You much confirm me in what I have received: for you grant the principal thing that I desire; but you add something more which I cannot fully close with, but shall plainly tell you what are my apprehensions of it. First, You grant that the act of faith by which we are united to Christ, and which goes first, is the Believing in, or Receiving whole Christ as Priest, Prophet, and King. This will do all that I desire. Secondly, You add, that another act, even the Receiving of his Righteousness is after necessary, that we may be justified. Your reason seems to be drawn from the difference of the effects: Union goes before Justification, therefore the uniting act goes before the justifying act. This is it that I deny; My Reasons are these. First, Scripture distinguisheth between our Union with Christ and our Justification: but no where between the uniting and justifying acts of faith. Secondly, The nature of the thing requireth it not, because faith justifies not

by

by a Physical causality, as fire warmeth me; but by the moral interest of a condition: and the same act may be the Condition of divers benefits. Thirdly, Scripture hath expresly made the Receiving of the person in his Relations to be the Condition of the participation of his benefits: [As many as received *him*, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; *John* 1.12. *whoever believeth in him shall not perish*, but, &c. *believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, &c.] Fourthly, Your own Similitude cleareth what I say: Though the wife have not *possession* of all that is her husbands as soon as she is married; yet she hath *Right* to all that is her part, and possession of the benefits meerly *Relative*, which consist but in a *Right*. The accepting his person in marriage is the condition to be by her performed to instate her in his Honours so far as she must partake of them. When she is made a wife by that Consent, there needs not any other act before she can be noble, honourable, a Lady, a Queen, *&c.* For the former was the full condition of the first possession of this benefit; and the benefit immediately resulteth from the Union. Fifthly, I conceive that these two acts which you mention are but one moral work (though divers Physical acts) and to be done without any interposition of time, before we can have Christ for Union or Justification. For the end is Essential to Relations: and he that receives Christ, must take him to some end and use: and that must be to Justifie, Reconcile and save him; to bring him to God that he may be blessed in him. He that doth not receive Christ to these ends, receiveth not Christ as Christ, and therefore cannot be united to him: and he that doth thus receive him, doth both those acts in one which you require. Sixthly, And the case is much different between Physical and Relative benefits: For its true, that when we are united to Christ, we may have after need of renewed acts of faith to actuate the Graces of the Spirit Inherent in us; For here *Right* is one thing, and *Possession* is another: But the *Relation* of Sonship, Justification, *&c.* are benefits that arise from the promise or free Gift by a meer resultancy to all that are united to Christ; and whoever hath present Right to them, even thereby hath possession of them, so that this answereth your Reason. For there is no such distance of time between our Union with Christ

and Justification, as that any acts of our own must interpose; but they are *in eodem instanti*, and differ only in order of nature. In sum, we prove a promise of pardon to all that receive Christ himself, and believe in him: If any will affirm the necessity of any other act before we can be justified, it is incumbent on them to prove it.

This was the substance of my Answer, to which the Reverend Bishop said no more; whether satisfied or not, I cannot tell: But I thought meet to recite his Judgement, both because it comes so neer the matter, and because I know not of any other that saith the same or so much of seeming strength against us.

Against all these seven particular Opinions, I am now to defend the Thesis; when I have first told you, in certain distinctions and propositions, how much I grant, and what I deny; which I shall in short dispatch.

And here I need but to rehearse what I have said already to Mr. *Blake*, pag. 3. 4. or to give you some short account of my thoughts to the same purpose.

First, We must not confound Justification by Constitution or Guift, and justification by the Sentence of the Judge, and the Execution of that sentence, which are three distinct things.

Secondly, We must not confound Justification with the assurance or feeling of Justification.

Thirdly, We must distinguish between our first Justification from a state of sin, and our daily Justification from particular Acts of sin.

Fourthly, Between that which is necessary on Christs part, and that which is necessary on our part to our Justification.

Fifthly, Between Christs purchasing our Justification, and his actual justifying of us.

Sixthly, Between these two senses of the phrase [*justified by Faith*] *viz.* as by an efficient Cause, or as a meer Condition.

Seventhly, Between the Causality of faith in the Physical effects of sanctification on the soul, and its conducing to the efficacy of the Promise in our Justification.

Proposition 1. *Ex parte Christi*, We easily grant that it

it is not his Teaching, or Ruling us, but his Ranſome and Obedience that are the Meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification and Salvation.

Propoſition 2. Therefore if Chriſt did juſtifie us *per modum objecti apprehenſi* in the neareſt ſenſe, as the Belief of ſacred Truths doth make a Qualitative impreſſion on the ſoul in our Sanctification, and the exciting and acting of our Graces then I ſhould confeſs that it is only that Act of Faith which is the apprehenſion of this Object, that doth help us directly to the benefit of the Object.

Propoſition 3. But it is not ſo: For the Object juſtifieth us cauſally by way of Merit and Moral procurement, and the benefit of that Merit is partly the Promiſe conveying to us Juſtification, and partly Juſtification conveyed by that Promiſe (not to ſpeak now of other benefits) and the Promiſe conveyeth Juſtification by Moral Donation as a deed of Gift, or a Pardon to a Traytor: Therefore the Gift flowing purely from the Will of the Giver, and the Promiſe or deed of Gift being the Immediate Inſtrumental efficient Cauſe of it, as it is *ſignum voluntatis Donatoris*, our Belief or Apprehenſion *qua talis* cannot juſtifie us, nor have any nearer or higher intereſt in our Juſtification, then to be the Condition of it, as it is a free Gift. And therefore the Condition muſt be judged of by the will of the Donor expreſſed in his Promiſe, and not immediately by the conceits of men concerning its natural agreeableneſs to the Object in this or that reſpect.

Propoſition 4. Yea, Even *ex parte Chriſti*, though he Merit Juſtification by his Ranſome and Obedience, yet he *actually juſtifieth* us as King of his Church, and that in regard of all the three ſorts or parts of Juſtification. He *giveth* it conſtitutively by his Promiſe, as *Lord* and *Legiſlator* and *Benefactor*, on theſe terms of Grace. He *ſentenceth* us Juſt, as our Judg; and he *executeth* that ſentence as a *Juſt* Judge, governing according to his Laws. So that if Faith *did* juſtifie *ex natura rei*, which they call its *Inſtrumentality*, I ſee not yet but that the apprehenſion of Chriſt as Lord and Judge muſt juſtifie us, becauſe the Object apprehended doth thus juſtifie us.

Propoſition 5. I eaſily grant that in our *Sanctification* or the

exciting and exercise of our Graces, the case standeth as the Opponents apprehend it to do in Justification. This Interest of the Act must be judged of by the Object apprehended. For it is not the Belief of a *Promise* that feareth us, but of a *Threatning*; nor the Belief of a *Threatning* that *Comforteth* us, but of a Promise. For here the Object worketh immediately on our minds, *per modum objecti apprehensi*: But in Justification it is not so, where God is the Agent as a Donor, and there can be nothing done by us, but in order to make us fit Subjects; and the change is not *Qualitative* by an *Object* as such, but *Relative* by a *Fundamentum* which is *without* us in the Gospel, and nothing *within* us but a qualifying Condition, without which it will not be done.

Proposition 6. Accordingly I easily grant, that the *Sense*, or *Assurance* of Justification in our Consciences is wrought by the *Object* as an *Object*: Because this *Assurance* is a part of our *Sanctification*. But that Object is not directly Christs *Ransome*, but the *Promise* through his blood, and our *own Faith* which is the condition of that Promise.

Proposition 7. I easily grant that Faith in Christ *as Lord* or *Teacher* of the *Church*, is not the Instrumental efficient Cause of our Justification: They need not therefore contend against me in this. But withall I say, that faith in his Priest-hood is not the Instrumental efficient Cause neither; though I allow it to have a nearer Physical Relation to the Ransome which meriteth our Justification.

Proposition 8. Though there is a greater shew of Reason to assert the Interest of the single Belief in Christs Priest-hood, for a *particular Pardon*, then for our *first general Pardon*; yet indeed it is but a shew, even there also. For it is not only the applying our selves to his blood or Ransome, but it is also the applying our selves to whole Christ, to make up the whole breach, that is the Condition of our *particular* Pardon, (so far as a particular Act of faith is a Condition) which though it be not a Receiving Christ for Union with him, as we did in the beginning, yet is it a receiving him *ad hoc et secundum quid*; and a renewed Consent to his whole Office, and adhesion to him as our special remedy for recovery from that fall, by freeing us both from the guilt and stain of Sin.

Proposition

Propoſition 9. It is undoubtedly the duty of every Sinner, in the ſenſe of his guilt and miſery, to fly to the Ranſome of Chriſts blood and the Merit of his Obedience, as the ſatisfaction to Gods Juſtice, and the Purchaſer of our Juſtification. And he that doth not this, how willing ſoever he may ſeem to learn of Chriſt as a Maſter, or to be ruled by him, yet cannot be juſtified or ſaved by him.

Propoſition 10. I eaſily grant that Faith *quâ Chriſtum Prophetam et Dominum recipit*, doth not juſtifie; but only *fides quâ Chriſtum Prophetam & Dominum recipit, & quâ eſt promiſſionis Conditio præſtita.* But then I ſay the ſame alſo of Faith in Chriſt as Prieſt, or in his Righteouſneſs.

Having explained my meaning in theſe ten Propoſitions, for preventing of Objections that concern not the Controverſie, but run upon miſtakes, *I ſhall now proceed* to prove the Theſis, which is this.

Theſis. *We are juſtified by God, by our Believing in Chriſt as Teacher and Lord, and not only by Believing in his blood or Righteouſneſs.*

Argument 1. My firſt Argument ſhall be from the Conceſſion of thoſe that we diſpute with. They commonly grant us the point contended for: Therefore we may take it for granted by them. If you ſay, What need you then diſpute the point, if they deny it not whom you diſpute with? I Anſwer, ſome of them grant it, and underſtand not that they grant it us; becauſe they underſtand not the ſenſe of our Aſſertion. And ſome of them underſtand that they grant it in our ſenſe, but yet deny it in another ſenſe of their own; and ſo make it a ſtrife about a ſyllable. But I ſhall prove the Conceſſion, leſt ſome yet diſcern it not.

If it be granted us, that Believing in Jeſus Chriſt as Lord and Teacher, is a real part of the Condition of our Juſtification, then is it granted us, that by this Believing in him we are juſtified, as by a Condition (which is our ſenſe, and all that we aſſert) But the former is true: Therefore ſo is the later.

For the proof of the Antecedent (which is all) Firſt, Try whether you can meet with any Divine that dare deny it, who

believeth that Faith is the Condition of the Covenant. Secondly, And I am sure their writings do ordinarily confess it. Their Doctrine that oppose us, is, That Faith is both a Condition and an Instrument: but other Acts, as Repentance, &c. may be Conditions, but not Instruments. And those that have waded so far into this Controversie, seem to joyne these other Acts of Faith with the Conditions, but not with the Instrument. Thirdly, They expresly make it antecedent to our Justification, as of moral necessity, *ex constitutione permittentis*; and say it is the *Fides quæ justificat*: which is the thing desired, if there be any sense in the words. Fourthly, They cannot deny to Faith in Christ, as Lord and Teacher, that which they commonly give to Repentance, and most of them to many other Acts. But to be a Condition (or part of the Condition) of Justification is commonly by them ascribed to Repentance; therefore they cannot deny it to these acts of faith. So that you see I may fairly here break off, and take the *Thesis pro Concessa*, as to the sense. Nothing more can be said by them, but against our phrase whether it be proper to say that we are justified By that which is but a bare Condition of our Justification, which if any will deny: First, We shall prove it by the consent of the world, that apply the word [*By*] to any Medium: And Dr. *Twiss* that told them (*contr. Corvinum*) over and over that a condition is a Medium, though it be not a cause; and I think none will deny it. Secondly, by the consent of many Texts of Scripture: But this must be referred to another Disputation, to which it doth belong, *viz.* about the Instrumentality of faith in justifying us, which, God willing, I intend also to perform.

Argument 2. The usual language of the Scripture, is, that we are justified by faith in Christ, or by believing in him, without any exclusions of any essential part of that faith. But faith in Christ doth essentially contain our believing in him as Teacher, Priest, and King, or Lord: therefore by believing in him as Teacher, Priest and Lord, we are justified.

The *Major* is past the denial of Christians, as to the first part of it. And for the second part, the whole cause lyeth on it; For the *Minor* also is past all controversie. For if it be essential to Christ as Christ to be God and man, the Redeemer, Teacher, Priest,

Prieſt and Lord: then it is eſſential to faith in Chriſt (by which we are juſtified) to believe in him as God and man, the Redeemer, Teacher, Prieſt and Lord. But the Antecedent is moſt certain: therefore ſo is the Conſequent.

The reaſon of the Conſequence, is, becauſe the act here is ſpecified from its Object. All this is paſt further queſtion.

All the Queſtion therefore is Whether Scripture do any where expound it ſelf, by excluding the other eſſential parts of faith, from being thoſe acts by which we are juſtified? and have limited our juſtification to any one act? This lyeth on the Affirmers to prove. So that you muſt note, that it is enough for me to prove that we are juſtified by faith in Chriſt Jeſus: for this Includeth all the eſſential acts; till they ſhall prove on the contrary, that it is but *ſecundum quid*, and that God hath excluded all other eſſential acts of faith ſave that which they aſſert: The proof therefore is on their part, and not on mine. And I ſhall try anon how well they prove it.

In the mean time, let us ſee what way the Scripture goeth, and obſerve that every Text by way of Authority, doth afford us a ſeveral Argument, unleſs they prove the excluſion.

Firſt, *Mark* 16. 15, 16, 17. [*Go ye into all the world and preach the Goſpel to every Creature: he that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved; and he that believeth not ſhall be damned: and theſe ſigns ſhall follow them that believe*, &c.] Here the faith mentioned, is the believing of the Goſpel, and the ſame with our becoming Chriſtians: and therefore not confined to one part or act of ſaving faith. That Goſpel which muſt be preached to all the world, is it that is received by the faith here mentioned; But that Goſpel doth eſſentially contain more then the doctrine of Chriſts Prieſthood: therefore ſo doth that faith.

Object. *It is not Juſtification but Salvation that is there promiſed.*

Anſw. It is that Salvation whereof Juſtification is a part: It is ſuch a Salvation as all have right to as ſoon as ever they believe and are baptized, which comprehendeth Juſtification: And the Scripture here and everywhere doth make the ſame faith without the leaſt diſtinction, to be the condition of Juſtification and of our Title to Glorification: and never parcels out the

ſeveral

several effects to several acts of faith; except only in those Qualities or Acts of the soul which faith is to produce as an efficient cause. To be justified by faith or Grace, and to be saved by faith or Grace, are promiscuously spoken as of the same faith or Grace.

Secondly, *John* 3.15,16,18. *He that believeth in him shall not perish, but have everla' ing life.*] [*He that believeth on him is not condemned.*] *Not to be condemned,* is *to be justified.* Condemnation and Justification are opposed in Scripture, *Rom.* 8. 33,34. Here therefore a *saving* faith and a *justifying* are made all one. And it is [*Believing in Christ*] without exclusion of any essential part, that is this faith; It is [*Believing in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.*] ver. 18. which is more then to believe his Ransom.

Thirdly, *John* 3.35,36. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand, he that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*] To have Gods wrath abide on him is to be unjustified. And the unbelievers opposed to the Believers before mentioned, are such as [*Believe not the Son:*] which phrase cannot possibly be limited to the affiance in his blood: It is the [ἀπειθῶν] often translated *Disobedient:* signifying, saith *Willet,* both unbelieving and disobedient, but rather *Disobedient,* properly it is *unpersuadable.* But of this more anon. And the faith here mentioned is [*Believing on the Son*] entirely, without exclusion of any essential acts; nay expresly including the act in question, by shewing that it is faith in Christ as Lord, into [whose hands the Father hath given all things] as the connexion of these words to the foregoing doth manifest.

Fourthly, *Rom.*1.16,17,18. *I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth——for therein is the Righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is Written, the just shall live by faith.*] where saving and justifying faith is made the same, and that is to be a believer of the Gospel, or in Christ, without limitation to any one essential part of it.

Fifthly, *Rom.*3.22. [*Even the Righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe.*]

Here

Here it is faith in Jesus Christ by which we are justified; which therefore includeth all that is essential to it.

Object. *Vers.* 25. *It is said to be by faith in his blood.*

Answ. 1. But there is not a syllable confining it to faith in his blood *alone*. It saith not, *(by faith only in his blood)* Secondly, The ordinary course of Scripture is to call it by that name *(faith in Jesus Christ)* which comprehendeth all thats essential to it. But sometime upon special occasions, its denominated from some one notable act or part, And that is, when it is the scope of the text, to denote more the distinct Intereſt of that part of Christs Office which is related to that act of faith, then any sole Intereſt of that act of faith it self. And so the Apostle here mentioneth faith in his blood as a special act, because he now draweth them especially to observe that blood which is the Object of it; and in other places he instanceth in other acts of faith; but commonly speaks of it entirely. And I think the Opponents will grant that as *(only)* is not here expressed, so neither is it implyed: for then it would exclude also, faith in the rest of his satisfactory Humiliation, or at least, in his active Righteousness, if not in his Person or Relation: of which more anon.

So *vers.* 18.30,31. Its called *(faith)* entirely, or without restriction by which we are justified; and therefore none of the essentials are excluded.

But it would be too tedious to recite the particular Texts: Its known, that [*by faith*] and [*by believing*] in Christ, without exclusion or limitation, is the common phrase of Scripture, when it speaks how we are justified: as may further be seen, *Rom.* 5.1, 2. & 9.32. *Gal.* 2.16. (*We are justified by the faith of Jesus Christ*, and by believing in Jesus Christ, as opposed to the works of the Law; but not by faith in his Priesthood, or Ransom, as opposed to faith in him as our Lord and Teacher) *Gal.* 3.11,24,25,26. & 5.5,6. *Eph* 2.8,9. & 3.12,17. *Phil.* 3.9. *Rom.* 9.30. *Heb.* 11. throughout, *John* 6.35,40,47. *Acts* 10.42,43. *Rom.* 10.10. *Acts* 13.39. From these and many the like I argue thus.

The Scripture doth ascribe our Justification to faith; and doth not limit it to any one part of faith, excluding the rest: Believing in Jesus Christ as Redeemer, Prophet, Priest and King, is essentially this faith. *Ergo*, &c.

If the Scripture ſpeaks of faith eſſentially, not limiting it *ad partem fidei*, then ſo muſt we: But the Scripture doth ſo; *Ergo*' &c. It is nowhere more neceſſary then in ſuch caſes this to hold to the Rule, of not diſtinguiſhing *ubi lex non diſtinguit*. Firſt, Becauſe it is an *adding* to the *doctrine* of Chriſt in a point of weight. Secondly, Becauſe it ſavoureth of a preſumptuous *detraction* from the *Condition* Impoſed by Chriſt himſelf. If a Prince do make a General act of Oblivion, pardoning all Rebels that will enter into Covenant with him, wherein they conſent to Accept his pardon, and take him for their Soveraign Lord; He that ſhall now ſay, that Returning to his Allegiance, or conſenting to the Princes Soveraignty, is no part of the Condition of the Traytors pardon, but that they are pardoned only by accepting of a pardon, and not by the other act, will certainly be guilty of *adding* to the act of his Prince, and of detracting from the condition by him required; and ſo is it in our preſent caſe.

If God ſpeak of any thing eſſentially, we muſt not preſume without ſufficient proof of the reſtriction, to expound it only *de parte eſſentiali*. If he invite a Gueſt to his marriage feaſt, he meanſ not the mans *head* only, or his *heart* only: for neither of theſe is the man. If he require a lamb in ſacrifice, we muſt not expound it of the *head* only, or *heart* only of a Lamb.

To this Argument (briefly in my Apology) Mr. *Blake* (having firſt excepted at the newneſs of the phraſe [Lord-Redeemer] doth anſwer thus [I *ſay, Chriſt is to be received as the Lord our Redeemer, and as our Maſter or Teacher; but faith in Juſtification eyes Redemption, not Dominion.*] Repl. Firſt, The Phraſe [*Faith in Juſtification*] is as unacceptable to me, as [*Lord-Redeemer*] is to you: not only for the Novelty, but the ambiguity, if not the falſe Doctrine which it *doth* import. Firſt, If the meaning be [*Faith as it is the Condition of our Juſtification,*] then its contrary to your own Conceſſion after, that this ſhould eye Chriſts Prieſt-hood only; and its an untruth, which you utterly fail in the proof, or do nothing to it. Secondly, If you mean [*Faith in its effecting of our Juſtification,*] then it importeth another miſtake, which you have not proved, *viz.* that faith doth effect our Juſtification. If you mean [*Faith in Receiving Juſtification*] either you mean the

the *proper* Passive Receiving, and this is but *Justificari*, and the man Receiveth it as the Subject, and his faith is but a Condition, or means of it: Or you mean the Moral *active Metaphorical Receiving*; which is nothing but *Consenting* that it shall be ours; or accepting: And this is neither part of Justification, nor proper Cause; but a Condition, and but part of the Condition: And therefore here your meaning must be one of these two, Either *That Act of Faith which is the accepting of Justification, is not the eying of Dominion*: To which I reply, First, taking it largely as a moral Act, its not true; for its comprehensive of both, of which more anon: but taking it strictly as one Physical Act, its true: Secondly, But then its nothing to the purpose: For we are not more truly justifyed by that Act which is the accepting of Justification, or Consenting to be justified, then we are by the Accepting of Christ for our Lord and Master; the reason of which, you have had before, and shall have more fully anon; or else you mean as before expressed, *That Act of Faith which is our Consenting to Justification, is the whole Condition of our Justification, and not the eying of Dominion*; But of that before. If I may Judge by your Doctrine elsewhere expressed, you mean only *That the act of Faith which accepteth of Justification, is the only Instrument of Justification*; of which in its due place: It may here suffice to say again, that I affirm not that in question to the be Instrument of it. Be not offended that I enquire into the sense of your ambiguous phrase, which I truly profess, is to me not intelligible, till you have *explained* in what sense it is that you intend it; and therefore my enquiry is not needless.

Ar. 3. If the Scripture doth (not only by the specificke Denomination, as was last proved, but also) by description, and mentioning those very acts, include the believing in Christ as our Lord and Teacher, *&c.* in that faith by which as a Condition, we are justified; then we are justified by believing in Christ as our Lord and Teacher, *&c.* not only as a sacrifice or Meriter of Justification. But the Antetedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent.

I prove the Antecedent by many Texts.

Rom. 10. 4,6,7,8,9,10. *For Christ is the end of the Law*

for Righteousness to every one that believeth. —— *But the Righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into Heaven? that is to bring Christ down from above: or who shall descend into the deep? that is to bring up Christ again from the dead: But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto Salvation.*] Here it is evident, that it is a *Believing unto Righteousness* that is mentioned, and therefore it is the Believing by which we are justified. And then it is evident that the faith here called [*a believing unto Righteousness*] is the believing in the *Lord Jesus*; expressly Christ as Lord and Saviour, is made the Object of it; and is not confined to a believing in one part of his Priesthood only. Also [*that God raised Christ from the dead*] is the expressed object of this faith. And the Resurrection of Christ is no part of his sacrifice or meer Priestly Office.

Rom. 4. 24, 25. [*But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*] Here it is evident that it is Justification it self that is the Benefit spoken of, even the *Imputing of Righteousness*: And that faith here is mentioned as the Condition of *that* Imputation [*If we believe*] And that this faith is described to be first a believing *in him that raised Christ*, and not only *in Christ*. Secondly, A believing *in Christ Jesus our Lord*, who is the express object of it; and so his Lordship taken in; and thirdly, a believing in his *Resurrection*, and not only in his blood or obedience. So that I see no room left to encourage any doubting, whether we are justified by believing in Christ as Lord, and in his Resurrection, and in God that raised him, as the Condition of our Justification.

John 1. 9, 11, 12. [*That was the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* —— *He came to his own, and his own received him not: But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, to them that believe in his Name.*] Here it is manifest, First, that it is the faith by which we are justified that is spoken of; for its commonly agreed that

that Justification is here included in Adoption, or at least that its the same act of faith by which we are adopted and justified. Secondly, Also that the object of this faith is Christ as the *Light*, which is not his meer Priesthood. Thirdly, And that it is his person in his full office, and not some single benefit. Fourthly, that it is called [*his Name* :] and [*Believing in his Name*] is more then consenting to be justified by his blood ; and in Scripture-sense comprehendeth his Nature and Office : and is all one as taking him as the true Messiah, and becoming his Disciples: Fifthly, And its much to be Noted, that it is not by way of Physical efficacy by apprehension (as I take Gold in my hand, and so receive possession of it) that faith hath its neareſt Interest in our Adoption : but it qualifieth the subject dispositively in the sight of God, and so God gives men *Power* thereupon to become his sons.

So the forecited words, *Iohn* 3.31,35,36. Where *Life* is given on Condition that we believe on the Son ; and that is expressed as the object of that faith, as he is one that [*Cometh from Heaven, and is above all, and whom the Father loveth, and hath given all things into his hands.*]

And so *Iohn* 5.22 23,24. [*He hath committed all judgement to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honor the Father ; Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into Condemnation*] Here the faith mentioned is that which freeth men from *Condemnation*, and therefore is it by which we are *Iustified:* And the object of it is the *Word* of Christ (and therefore not only his Priesthood) and the *Father as sending the Son*, even to his whole office of Redemption.

Moreover, that faith by which our Justification is continued, it is begun by this (both they and we are agreed in, though some yield not that any thing more is required to its continuance.) But the faith by which Justification is continued, is the *Belief of the Gospel, which is preached to every Creature* and not only one branch of it. *Col.* 1.21,22,23. And it is called, *Col.* 2.6. a *Receiving Christ Iesus the Lord.*

John 20.31. *These things are written, that ye might believe that Iesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that believing ye might*

have life through his Name :] That faith by which we have life, is certainly it by which we are justified : for as Justification is part of that life, so Right to Eternal life is given on the same terms as Justification is. And the object of this faith here is, Christ in Person and entire Office, the Son of God by whose Name we have life.

Acts 2.30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38. [*Knowing that God had sworn with an Oath to him, that of the fruit of his loynes according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ, to sit upon his Throne, he seeing this before spake of the Resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in his Hell, neither his flesh did see Corruption : This Iesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses ; therefore being by the right hand of God exalted ——— therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made this same Iesus whom ye have Crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this —— Then* Peter *said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Iesus Christ, for the Remission of sins ———.*] Here it is evident that Remission of sins is a Benefit that by this faith they were to be made partakers of ; and so that it is the faith by which we are justified, that they are Invited to : And that the Object of this faith *implyed in the terms, Repent and be baptized*, &c. is the Name of Jesus Christ, and that eminently in his exaltation, as Risen, and *set* at the Right hand of God, and as Lord and *Christ*.

So *Acts* 3.19. 22.15. *Repent therefore and be Converted, that your sins may be blotted out ——For* Moses *truly said, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up ——.*] Here the Jews are accused for killing the Prince of life, *vers.*15. and exhorted to Repent thereof, and so of their Infidelity, and be converted (to Christ, and so to become Christians,) which is more then one act of faith ; and this was that their sins may be blotted out : And Christ as Prophet is propounded to them as the object of this faith, which they are exhorted to.

So *Act.* 10. 42,43. with 36,37,38,40,41. [*And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testifie that it is he that is ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead ; to him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name, Whosoever believeth in him shall receive Remission of sins.*] Here the faith is described

described which hath the Promise of Remission. And the Object of it is at large set out to *be Jesus Christ as Lord of all*, ver. 36. *as anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, raised from the dead, and made the Judge of the quick and the dead*; and it is called entirely a *Believing in him*, and the Remission is through his name.

Act. 16. 31. The faith of the Jaylor as perswaded to for life, is the *believing in the Lord Jesus Christ* entirely: and it is called *a Believing in God*, ver. 34.

1 *Pet.* 2. 4, 5, 6, 7. The faith there mentioned is that By which we are justified; *he that believeth on him shall not be confounded*; and the Object of it is, *whole Christ as the Corner stone, Elect and Precious.*]

John 5. 10, 11, 12. [The faith there mentioned, is that by which we *have Christ and Life*]: And the Object of it is, [*the Son of God*] and [*God*] and [*the record that God gave of his Son*] even [*that God hath given us eternal Life, and this life is in his Son.*]

Mat. 11. 27, 28, 29. The faith there mentioned, is called [*a comming to Christ weary and heavy-laden, that he may give them rest*] which must comprehend Rest from the Guilt of sin and punishment. And the Act of that Faith is directed to Christ as one to whom *all Power is given by the Father*, and as one whose yoak and burden we must take upon us. But I shall add no more for this.

To this last Mr. *Blake* saith, *pag.* 564. *This Text shews the Duty of men to be, not alone to seek rest and ease from Christ, but to learn of Christ and follow him: But neither their learning nor their imitation, but faith in his blood, is their freedom or Justification.* Repl. Properly neither one act of faith nor other is our Justification. Faith is a *Quality* in the Habit, and an act in the exercise: and Justification is a *Relation*. Faith is a part of our Sanctification; Therefore it is not our Justification. But supposing you speak Metonymically, I say both acts of faith are our Justification, that is, the *Condition* of it. And the Text proves it, by making our Subjection not only a Duty, but an expres Condition of the Promise. And this Conditionality you here before and after do confess or grant.

Argument

Argument 4. If we are justified by Christ as Priest, Prophet and King conjunctly, and not by any of these alone, much less by his Humiliation and Obedience alone; then according to the Opponents own Principles (who argue from the distinct Interest of the several parts of the Object, to the distinct Interest of the several acts of faith) we are justified by believing in Christ as Priest, Prophet and King, and not as Humble and Obedient only. But we are justified by Christ as Priest, Prophet and King, *&c. Ergo*, &c.

The Consequence is their own. And the Antecedent I shall prove from several texts of Scripture, and from the nature of the thing, beginning with the last.

And first it is to be supposed, That we are all agreed that the blood and Humiliation of Jesus Christ, are the Ransome and Price that satisfieth the Justice of God for our sins, and accordingly must be apprehended by the Believer: And many of us agree also, that his Active obedience as such, is part of this satisfaction, or at least, Meritorious of the same effect of our Justification. But the thing that I am to prove, is, that the Meritorious Cause is not the only Cause and that Christ in his other actions, is as truly the efficient Cause, as in his meriting, and that all do sweetly and harmoniously concur to the entire effect; and that faith must have respect to the other causes of our Justification, and not alone to the Meritorious Cause, and that we are Justified by this entire work of Faith and not only by that Act which respects the satisfaction or merit. And first, I shall prove that Christ doth actually justifie us as King.

The word *Justification*, as I have often said (and its past doubt) is used to signifie these three Acts. First, Condonation, or constitutive Justification, by the Law of Grace or Promise of the Gospel. Secondly, Absolution by sentence in Judgement, Thirdly, The Execution of the former, by actuall Liberation from penalty. The last is oftener call'd Remission of sin; the two former are more properly called Justification.

First, As for the first of these, I argue this: If Christ do as King, and Benefactor, (on supposition of his antecedent Merits,) Enact the Law of Grace or promise by which we are justified, then doth he as King and Benefactor justifie us by Condonation.

on, or constitution. For the Promise is his Instrument by which he doth it. But the Antecedent is certain, therefore so is the Consequent.

As the Father by Right of Creation was Rector of the new created world, and so made the Covenant of Life that was then made: so the Son (and the Father) by Right of Redemption is Rector of the new Redeemed world, and so made the Law of Grace, that gives Christ and Life to all that will believe. As it is a Law, it is the Act of a King: As it is a Deed of Gift, it is the Act of a Benefactor: as it is founded in his death, and supposeth his satisfaction, thereby it is called his Testament. In no respect is it part of his satisfaction or Humiliation or Merit itself, but the true effect of it. So that Christs merit is the Remote Moral Cause of our Justification, but his granting of this promise or Act of Grace, is the true natural efficient Instrumental Cause of our Justification, even the Immediate Cause.

Secondly, Justification by sentence of Judgement is undeniably by Christ as King: For God hath appointed to Judge the World by him, *Act.* 17.31. and hath committed all Judgement to him, *John* 5. 22. And therefore as Judge he doth justifie and Condemn. This is not therefore any part of his Humiliation or Obedience, by which he ransometh sinners from the Curse. To deny these things, is to deny Principles in Politicks.

Thirdly, And then for the Execution of the sentence by actual liberation, there is as little room for a doubt, this being after both the former, and the act of a Rector, and not of a Surety in the form of a servant. So that it is apparent, that as the Merit of our Justification is by Christ in his Humiliation; So our actual Justification in all three senses is by Christ as King.

And therefore Faith in order to Justification, must accordingly respect him.

Secondly, As the Teacher of the Church, Christ doth not immediately justifie, but yet mediately he doth, and it is but mediately that he justifieth by his Merits. The Gospel is a Law that must be promulgate and expounded, and a Doctrine that must be taught and pressed on sinners, till they receive it and believe,

that they may be justified: And this Christ doth as the Teacher of his Church. And Faith must accordingly respect him.

Thirdly, The Resurrection of Jesus Christ was part of his exaltation by Power and Conquest, and not of his Humiliation; and yet we are justified by his Resurrection, as that which both shewed the perfection of his satisfaction, & by which he entred upon that state of Glory, in which he was to apply the benefits.

Fourthly, The Intercession of Christ is a part of his office, as he is a Priest for ever after the order of *Melchizedeck*: but it is no part of his Humiliation or Ransome. And yet we are justified by his Intercession: And therefore Faith must respct it for Justification.

Let us now hear what The Scripture saith in these cases, *Mattthew* 9. 6. [*But that you may know that the Son of man hath Power on earth to forgive sins*, &c.] Here it is plainly made an Act of Power, and not of Humiliation, to forgive sins.

Mat. 11. 27, 28, 29. *All things are delivered unto me of my Father*, &c. *Come to me all ye that are weary*, &c. so *Mat.* 28. 18, 19. compared with *Mark* 16. 15, 16. shew that it is an act of Christ exalted or in Power, to pardon, or grant the promise of Grace.

John 1. 12. *To give power to men to become the Sons of God, must be an act of Power.*

John 5. 22, 23, 24. it is expres of the sentence.

Acts 5. 31. [*Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.*] He forgiveth as a Prince and Saviour.

Act. 10. 42, 43. he is preached as the *Judge of quick and dead*, and so made the Object of the faith, by which we have Remission of sins.

Rom. 4. 25. [*Who was delivered for our offences, and raised for our justification.*] And this Resurrection (as is said) was part of his Exaltation. And the Apostle thence concludes (as is aforesaid) that this is the faith that is Imputed to us for Righteousnes [*If we believe in him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*] vers. 26.

Rom. 8. 33, 34. [*Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? it is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? it is*

Christ

Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.] Here *God*, and the *Resurrection*, and *Session at Gods right hand*, and the *intercession of Christ*, are all made the grounds or causes of our Justification, and not only Christs death; Yea, it is expreſt by [*it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen*, &c.]

1 *Cor.*15.1,2 3,4. The faith by which *Paul* tells them they were saved, had Christs Resurrection for its object, as well as his dying for our sins.

*Phil.*3.8.9,10. *Pauls* way of Justification was first to [*win Christ, and be found in him*] and so to have a *Righteousness of God by faith in Christ* (whole Christ,) *and not that of the Law: that he might know the power of his Resurrection*, &c.

The true Nature of this faith is described, 1 Pet.1.21. [*Who by him do believe in God that raised him from the dead, and gave him Glory, that your Faith and Hope may be in God.*]

1 *Pet.*3.21. [*The like Figure whereunto even Baptism, doth now also save us — by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into Heaven, and is on the right hand of God; Angels and Authorities, and Powers, being made subject to him.*] It is certain that the salvation of *Baptism* consisteth very much in Remission of sin or Justification.

In a word, it is most evident in Scripture, that merit and satisfaction are but the moral, remote preparatory Causes of our Justification (though exceeding eminent, and must be the daily study, and everlasting praise of the Saints) and that the perfecting nearer efficient causes, were by other acts of Christ; and that all concurred to accomplish this work. And therefore even *ex parte Christi*, the work is done by his several acts, though merited by him in his humiliation only. And therefore it is past doubt on their own principles, that faith must respect *all*, in order to our Justification. And the faith by which we are justified must be that of the Eunuch, *Acts* 8.37. that *believed with all his heart that Christ was the son of God*, and so received him as Christ entirely.

Argument 5. If it be a necessary Condition of our *being baptized for the Remission of sin*, that we *profess* a belief in more then Christs Humiliation and merits then is it a necessary Condi-

tion of our *actual Remission of sin*, that we *really believe* in more than Christs Humiliation and Merits: But the Antecedent is certain. For the Prescript, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20, and the constantly used form of Baptism, and the Texts even now mentioned, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Act.* 8. 37. do all shew it: And I have more fully proved it in my Dispute of Right to Sacraments. And the Consequence is undeniable: And I think all will be granted.

Argument 6. If the Apostles of Christ themselves before his death, were justified by believing in him as the son of God, and the Teacher and King of the Church, (yea perhaps without believing at all in his Death and Ransom thereby) then the believing in him as the son of God, and Teacher and King, conjunct with believing in his blood, are the faith by which we are now justified. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent.

The reason of the Consequence is, because it is utterly improbable that the addition of further light and objects for our faith, should null the former, and that which was all or so much of their justifying faith, should be now no part of ours.

The Antecedent I prove, *Matth.* 16. 21. 22, 23. [*From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his Disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the Elders and chief Priests and Scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day: then* Peter *took him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee Lord, this shall not be unto thee*] &c. —— John 12. 16. *These things understood not his Disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then*, &c. Luke 28. [*Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them; Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the son of man, shall be accomplished: For he shall be delivered to the Gentiles, and shall be mocked and spitefully intreated and spit upon, and they shall scourge him and put him to death, and the third day he shall rise again: And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.*]

Luke 24. 20, 21, 22. [*The chief Priests and Rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him; but we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and be-*

side

side all this to day is the third day since these things were done; and certain women also of our company made us astonished which were early at the Sepulchre —— O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his Glory? vers. 45. *Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scripture.*]

John 20.9. [*For as yet they knew not the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead.*] By all this it is plain that the Disciples then believed not *Christs death or Resurrection.*

Yet that they were justified, is apparent in many Texts of Scripture, where Christ pronounceth them *clean by the word which he had spoken*, John 15.3. and oft called them *blessed*, Mat. 5. & 16.17. *Luke* 6. And he saith that *the Father loved them:* John 16.27. They were *branches in him the living Vine, and* exhorted *to abide in him*, John 15.5,6,7. —— And that they were *Believers* is oft expreſt; and particularly that they *Believed in him as the son of God,* and *trusted it was he that should redeem Israel:* that is by *Power*, and not by *Death*: and that they took him for their *Master and Teacher, and the King of Israel;* some of them desiring to *sit at his right and left hand in his Kingdom, and striving who should be the greatest about him*, John. 16.27. *The Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.*] John 1.49. [*Nathaniel answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the son of God: thou art the King of Israel*] Here was the saving faith of the Disciples, *Matth.* 16.16. *Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the son of the living God.*]

Object. *But was it possible for them to be justified without the blood of Christ?*

Answ. No: as to the Fathers acceptance, his blood even then before it was shed, was the meritorious cause of their Justification: But they were justified by it, without the knowledge or belief of it, though not without faith in Christ as the son of God, the Messiah, the Rabbi, and the King of Israel. Which also shews that faith did not then justifie them in the new Notion of an Instrumental cause apprehending the purchasing cause; or that the effects of Christs several acts were not diversifyed according to the several acts of faith to those as Objects.

I hope all that have Christian Ingenuity will here understand, that I speak not this in the least measure to diminish the excellency or necessity of that act of faith which consisteth in the believing on Christ as crucified, or in his blood and Ransom! Or that I think it less necessary then the other to us now, because the Disciples then were justified without it. I know the case is much altered; and that is now of necessity to Justification that was not then. But all that I endeavour is, to shew that we are justified by the other acts of faith, as well as this, because it is not likely that those acts should not be now justifying, in conjunction with this, by which men were then justified without this.

Argument 7. If the satisfaction and merits of Christ be the only Objects of the justifying act of faith, then (according to their own principles) they must on the same reason, be the only objects of the sanctifying and saving acts of faith. But the satisfaction and merit of Christ are not the only Objects of the sanctifying and saving acts of faith: therefore not of the justifying.

To this Mr. *Blake* answereth, by finding an Equivocation in the word Merit; and four terms in the Syllogism (as in other terms I had expressed it.) And saith [*We look at Christ for justification as satisfying Justice, and meriting pardon and remission, not as meriting sanctification.*] Repl. But this is his misunderstanding of plain words. The term [*Meritor*] was not equivocal, but the General comprehending both effects: And that which he nakedly affirms, is the thing which the Argument makes against. Here it is supposed as a granted truth, that we can be no more sanctified, then justified without Christs blood and merits: and so the scope of the Argument is this. Christ as a Ransom and a Meritor of sanctification, is not the only object of the sanctifying act of faith: therefore by parity of Reason, Christ as a Ransom and Meritor of Justification, is not the only object of the justifying act of faith. The Antecedent of this Enthymeme or the *Minor* of the Argument thus explained, is not denied by them. They confess that faith for sanctification doth receive Christ himself not only as the Meritor of it, but as Teacher Lord, King Head, Husband; and doth apply his particular promises. But the meriting sanctification by his Blood

and

and Obedience, is no part of Christs Kingly or Prophetical Office, but belongs to his Priesthood, as well as the meriting of justification doth. For Christs sacrifice layes the general Ground-work of all the following benefits, both Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, Glorification: but it doth immediately effect or confer none of them all; but there are appointed wayes for the collation of each one of them after the Purchase or Ransom. So that if the apprehending of the Ransom which is the general Ground do only justifie; then the apprehending of the same Ransom as meriting sanctification, should only sanctify. And neither the justifying nor sanctifying acts of faith should respect either Christs following acts of his Priesthood, (Intercession) nor yet his Kingly or Prophetical office at all. And therefore as the sanctifying act must respect Christs following applicatory acts, and not the purchase of sanctification only; so the justifying act (to speak as they) must respect Christs following Collation or application, and not only his Purchase of Justification. And then I have that I plead for: becaufe Christ effectively justifies as King.

Argument 8. It is the same faith in Habit and Act by which we are Justified, and by which we have right to the spirit of sanctification (for further degrees) and Adoption, Glorification, *&c.* But it is believing in Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, by which *we* have Right to the spirit of sanctification, to Adoption and Glorification: Therefore it is the believing in Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, by which we are justified.

The *Minor* I suppose will not be denyed; Iam sure it is commonly granted. The *Major* I prove thus.

If the true Christian faith be but one in essence, and one undivided Condition of all these benefits of the Covenant; then it is the same by which we are justified, and have Right to the other benefits (that is, they are given us on that one undivided Condition) But the Antecedent is true: as I prove by parts thus.

First, That it is but one in essence, I think will not be denied; If it be, I prove it, first, from *Ephe.* 4. 5. *There is one faith.*

Secondly, If Christ in the Essentials of a Saviour to be believed in, be but *One*, then the faith that receiveth him, can be but

but One: But the former is true: Therefore so is the later. Thirdly, If the belief in Christ as Prophet, as Prieſt, and as King, be but ſeveral Eſſential parts of the Chriſtian faith, and not ſeveral ſorts of faith, and no one of them is the true Chriſtian faith it ſelf alone (no more then a Head or a Heart is a humane body,) then true faith is *but one* (conſiſting of its eſſential parts) But the Antecedent is undoubted, therefore ſo is the Conſequent.

Secondly, And as Faith in Eſſence is but One faith, ſo this One faith is but One undivided Condition of the Covenant of Grace, and it is not one part of faith that is the Condition of one benefit, and another part of another, and ſo the ſeveral benefits given on ſeveral acts of faith, as ſeveral conditions of them: but the entire faith in its Eſſentials is the condition of each benefit: and therefore every eſſential part is as well the Condition of one promiſed benefit, as of another. This I prove: Firſt, In that Scripture doth nowhere thus divide, and make one part of faith the condition of Juſtification, and another of Adoption, and another of Glorification; *&c.* and therefore it is not to be done. No man can give the leaſt proof of ſuch a thing from Scripture. It is before proved that its one entire faith that is the Condition. Till they that divide or multiply conditions according to the ſeveral benefits and acts of Faith, can prove their diviſion from Scripture, they do nothing.

Secondly, we find in Scripture not only *Believing in Chriſt* made the One Condition of all benefits: but the ſame particular acts or parts of this faith, having ſeveral ſorts of benefits aſcribed to them (though doubtleſs but as parts of the whole conditions.) Its eaſie, but needleſs to ſtay to inſtance.

Thirdly, Otherwiſe it would follow by parity of reaſon, that there muſt as many Conditions of the Covenant as there be benefits to be received by it, to be reſpected by our faith: which would be apparently abſurd. Firſt, Becauſe of the number of Conditions. Secondly, Becauſe of the quality of them. For then not only Juſtification muſt have one condition, & Adoption another, and Sanctification another, and Glorification another, and Comfort and Peace of Conſcience another, but perhaps ſeveral graces

graces must have several conditions, and the several blessings for our present life and Relations and Callings, and so how many sorts of Faith should we have as well as justifying faith? even one faith Adopting, another Glorifying &c.

And (as to the quality) it is a groundless conceit that the belief or Acceptance of every particular inferiour mercy should be our title to that particular mercy: For then the covetous would have title to their Riches, because they accept them as from Christ, and the natural man would have this title to his health, and life, and so of the rest: whereas it is clear that it is faith in Christ as Christ, as God and man, King Priest and Prophet, that is the condition of our Title, even to health, and life, and every bit of bread so far as we have it as heirs of the Promise.

The promise is that *all things shall work together for good* (not to every one that is willing to have the benefit, but) *to them that love God*, Rom.8.28. *If we seek first the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness*, (*not* righteousness alone, much less pardon alone) *other things shall be added*, Matth.6.33.

Fourthly, If the Receiving of Christ as Christ, essentially, be that upon which we have title to his benefits, then there are not several acts of faith receiving those several benefits, necessary as the condition of our Title to them. But the Antecedent is true: as I prove thus.

The Title to Christ himself includeth a title to all these benefits (that are made over to the heirs of Promise:) But on our acceptance of Christ we have title to Christ himself: therefore upon our acceptance of Christ (as the simple condition) we have title to all these benefits.

*Rom.*8.32. [*He that spared not his own son, but gave him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?*] so that *all things* are given in the gift of Christ, or *with him*. Therefore *Receiving him* is the means of *Receiving all*.

1 John 5.11,12. [*God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his son: He that hath the son hath life; and he that hath not the son hath not life.*] So that accepting Christ as Christ, makes him ours (by way of condition;) and then our life of Justification and sanctification is in him and comes with him.

Coming to Christ as Christ, is the sole undivided condition

of *Life*, John 5.40. *Ye will not come to me that ye may have Life.*]

Yet here I must crave that Ingenuous dealing of the Reader, that he will observe (once for all, and not expect that I should on every call recite it) that though I maintain the unity of the condition, not only in opposition to a *separating* division, but also to a distributive division of Conditions; yet I still maintain these three things. First, that *quoad materiale Conditionis*, that faith which is the condition, doth believe all the essential parts of Christs office *distinctly*; and so it doth not look to his *Exaltation* in stead of his *Humiliation*; nor *è Contra*; but looks to be *Ransomed* by him as a *sacrifice*, and *meritoriously* justified by his *Merits*, and *actually* justified by him as *King*, *Judge*, and *Benefactor*, &c. And that it eyeth also *distinctly* those *Benefits* which salvation doth *essentially* consist in (at least.) And it takes Christ finally to Justifie, Adopt, Sanctifie, Glorifie, *&c. distinctly*. But still its but one condition on which we have Title to all this.

Secondly, That I maintain that in the *Real work* of *sanctification*, the several acts of faith on several objects are distinct efficient causes of the acting of several Graces in the soul. The Belief of every attribute of God, and every Scripture truth, hath a several real effect upon us: But it is not so in *Justification*, nor any receiving of *Right* to a benefit by Divine *Donation*; for there our faith is not a true efficient cause, but a Condition: and faith as a condition is but One, though the efficient acts are divers. The Belief of several Texts of Scripture, may have as many sanctifying effects on the soul; But those are not several conditions of our Title thereto. God saith not I will excite this Grace if thou wilt believe this Text, and that grace if thou wilt believe that Text. In the exercise of Grace God worketh by our selves as efficient causes: but in the Justifying of a sinner, God doth it wholly and immediately himself without any Co-efficiency of our own, though we must have the disposition or Condition.

Thirdly, I still affirm, that this One undivided condition may have divers appellations from the Respect to the *Consequent* benefits (for I will not call them the *effects*;) This one faith may be

be denominated (importing only the Intereſt of a condition) a *juſtifying* faith, a *ſanctifying* faith, an *Adopting* faith, a *ſaving* faith, *preſerving* faith, *&c.* But this is only, if not by extrinſick denomination, at the moſt but a Virtual or Relative diſtinction; As the ſame Center may have divers denominations from the ſeveral lines that meet in it: Or the ſame Pillar or Rock may be Eaſt, Weſt, North, or South, *ad lævam, vel ad dextram*, in reſpect to ſeveral other Correlates: Or (plainly) as one and the ſame Antecedent, hath divers denominations from ſeveral *Conſequents*. So if you could give me health, wealth, Honor, Comfort, *&c.* on the condition that I would but ſay One word [*I thank you*:] that one word, might be denominated an enriching word, an honouring word, a comforting word from the ſeveral Conſequents. And ſo may faith. But this makes neither the *Materiale*, nor the *Formale* of the Condition to be divers: either the faith it ſelf, or condition of the Promiſe.

Argument 9. If there be in the very nature of a Covenant Condition in general, and of Gods impoſed Condition in ſpecial, enough to perſwade us that the benefit dependeth uſually as much or more on ſome other act, as on that which accepteth the benefit it ſelf: then we have reaſon to judge that our Juſtification dependeth as much on ſome other act, as on the acceptance of Juſtification; but the Antecedent is true, as I prove; Firſt, As to Covenant Condition in general, it is moſt uſual to make the promiſe conſiſt of ſomwhat which the party is willing of, and the condition to conſiſt of ſomewhat which the Promiſer will have; but the Receiver hath more need to be drawn to. And therefore it is that the Accepting of the benefit promiſed is ſeldome, if ever, expreſly made the Condition (though implicitly it be part;) becauſe it is ſuppoſed that the party is willing of it. But that is made the expreſs condition, where the party is moſt unwilling: So when a Rebel hath a pardon granted on condition he come in, and lay down arms, it is ſuppoſed that he muſt humbly and thankfully accept the pardon; and his returning to his allegiance, is as truly the condition of his pardon, as the putting forth his hand and taking it is. If a Prince do offer himſelf in maraiage to the pooreſt Beg-

gar, and consequently offer Riches and Honors with himself, the accepting of his person is the expressed condition, more then the accepting of the riches and honors; and the latter dependeth on the former. If a Father give his son a purse of gold on condition he will but kneel down to him, or ask him forgiveness of some fault: here his kneeling down and asking him forgiveness, doth more to the procurement of the gold, then putting forth his hand and taking it.

Secondly, And as for Gods Covenant *in specie*, it is most certain, that God is his own end, and made and doth all things for himself. And therefore it were blasphemy to say that the Covenant of Grace were so free as to respect *mans* wants only, and not Gods Honor and Ends, yea or man before God. And therefore nothing is more certain then that both as to the ends, and mode of the Covenant, it principally respecteth the Honor of God. And this is it that man is most backward to, though most obliged to. And therefore its apparent that this must be part, yea the principal part of the condition. Every man would have pardon and be saved from hell: God hath promised this which you *would have*, on condition you will yield to that which naturally you *would not have*. You *would have* Happiness; but God *will have* his preeminence; and therefore you *shall have* no Happiness but in him. You *would have* pardon: but God *will have* subjection, and Christ *will have* the honour of being the bountifull procurer of it, and *will* be your Lord, and Teacher, and Sanctifier as well as Ransom: If you will yield to one, you shall have the other. So that your Justification dependeth as much on your Taking Christ for your Lord and Master, as on your receiving Justification or consenting to be pardoned by him. Yea the very mode of your acceptance of Christ himself and the benefits offered you, (that you take them thankfully, lovingly, humbly, renouncing your own worth, *&c.*) are necessary parts of the condition of your pardon. There is as great a Necessity laid upon that part of the Condition which Christs honour lieth on, and that in order to your Justification, as of that part which directly respecteth your Salvation. And me thinks common reason and ingenuity should tell you that it must be so, and that its just and meet it should be so. And therefore

I may safely conclude *ex natura rei*, that the taking of Christ for our Teacher and Lord, is as truly a part of the condition of our Justification, and our Justification lieth as much upon it, as the Affiance in Christs sufferings.

If you say, [*But the efficiency is not equal, though it be equally a Condition*] I answer; Neither of them have any proper efficiency in justifying us, unless you will unfitly call the *Conditionality* an *Efficiency*, or the *Acceptableness* of believing in the sight of God, an efficiency; there is no such thing to be ascribed to our faith as to the effect of Justification. But this belongs to another Controversie.

I know not what can be said more against this, unless by the *Antinomians* who deny the covenant of Grace to have any proper Condition, but only a priority and posteriority of Duties. But the expres conditional terms of the Covenant do put this so far out of doubt, and I have said so much of it in other writings, that I shall not trouble my self here with this sort of Adversaries: Only to prevent their mistake, I shall tell them this: that in a condition there is somewhat *Essential*, and that is found in the conditions of Gods Promise; and therefore they are proper conditions: and there is somewhat *Accidental*: as First, sometime that the thing be *Uncertain* to the Promiser: This is not in Gods Conditions: It is enough that in their own nature the things be contingent. Secondly, That the matter of the condition be somewhat that is gainfull to the Promiser, or otherwise have a merit, or moral causality: But this is separable: In our case it is sufficient that it be somewhat that God *liketh, loveth*, or is pleasing to him, though it properly merit not.

And the evident Reason why God hath made some Promises conditional, is, that his Laws and Promises may be perfectly suited to the nature of man on whom they must work, and so may shew forth Gods Infinite Wisdom, and may in a way agreeable to our natures attain their ends: and man may be drawn to that which he is backward to, by the help of that which he is naturally more forward to, or by the fear of that evil which naturally he doth abhor: As also that the Holiness of God may shine forth in his Word; and it may be seen that he loveth Justice, Holiness, Obedience, and not only the persons of men: and so

all his Attributes may be seen in their conjunction and the beauty that thence resulteth in the Glass of his Word.

Argument 10 If the condemning Unbelief which is the Privation of the faith by which we are justified, be the Not-believing in Christ as King, Priest and Prophet, than the faith by which we are justified, is the believing in him as King, Priest and Prophet. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent.

Only the Antecedent needs proof, though the Consequence have the hard hap to be denyed also.

Here note, that by *The condemning Unbelief*, I mean that which is the peremptory-condemning sin according to the special Commination of the Gospel: Where I suppose first, that there is a condemnation of the Law of Nature or works, which is simply for sin as sin. Secondly, And a distinct condemnation by the New Law of Grace, which is not simply for sin as sin, but for one sort of sin in special, that is, the final rejection of the Remedy: And of this sort of condemnation I speak in the Argument. The confirmation of this distinction I shall be further called to anon by Mr. *Blake*.

The Antecedent I prove. First, from *John* 3. 18, 19. 20, 21. [*He that believeth on him is not condemned*, (There's the justifying faith:) *But he that believeth not, is condemned already*, (Theres the condemning unbelief, contradictory to the justfying faith) [*Because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God:*] (here is a special condemnation proved, distinct from that by the Law of works.) [*And this is the condemnation* (that is the condemning *sin or cause*) *that light is come into the World, and men loved darkness rather then light, because their deedt were evil*] *For every one that doth evil hateth the light*, &c. The 19 verse describeth the Condemning unbelief, and the 20. gives the reason of mens guiltiness of it. And the unbelief described is a shunning or not coming to Christ as he is the Light to discover and heal their evil deeds. So that if contradictories will but shew the nature of each other, I think our controversie is here plainly resolved.

So is it in *Psal* 2. 12. [*Kise the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way; when his Wrath is kindled but a little, blessed*

are all they that put their truſt in him.] The faith that ſaves from puniſhment, ſaveth from Guilt: The faith that ſaves from Guilt, is juſtifying faith: The faith here deſcribed, is that which ſaves from puniſhment: And the faith here deſcribed is [*kiſſing the Son,*] which comprehendeth ſubjection, and dependance, and love; and is the ſame for all that, which is after called [*truſting in him.*]

So *Luke* 19. 27. [*But thoſe mine enemies which would not that I ſhould raign over them, bring hither, and deſtroy them before me.*] Unwillingneſs to have Chriſt raign over them, is here made (not a common, but) the ſpecial condemning ſin, called commonly Unbelief; and ſo is the contrary to juſtifying faith.

So *John* 3, 36. [*He that believeth on the Son,* (this as all confeſs, is juſtifying faith) *hath everlaſting life: and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*] Here it is apparent that this Unbelief is the privation, the contradictory or contrary to juſtifying faith. Firſt, becauſe they are ſo directly oppoſed here denominatively, that elſe the words would be equivocal, and not intelligible. Secondly, Becauſe the contrariety of effects alſo is added to put the thing paſt doubt. [*The wrath of God abideth on him*] is contrary to *juſtifying*, which takes the *wrath* of *God* off him; eſpecially conſidering, that it is curſing, comminatory, obliging wrath that is principally meant; the great executing wrath being not on men till their damnation.

And that materially this unbelief thus oppoſed to juſtifying faith doth conſiſt in contumacy, rebellion, or unperſwadableneſs, is plain in the words, [ὁ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ.] which ſignifie [*They that are contumacious or diſobedient to the Son, or unperſwadible.*]

And 1 *John* 5. 10. 11, 12. This faith and unbelief are oppoſed; and the unbelief conſiſteth in [*not believing the record that God hath given of his Son*] and that record is not only concerning Juſtification, or the merit of it.

So 2. *Theſ.* 2. 12. [*That all they might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.*] So 2 Theſſ. 1. 8, 9, 10. [*That obey not the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*]

Christ] is the description of the *Unbelievers*, opposed to [*them that believe*,] ver. 10.

So *Jo.* 8. 24. [*If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*,] which as to the act and effect is contrary to justifying faith. And [*that I am he*] is not only [*that I am the Ransome*] But also [*that I am the Messiah and Redeemer.*]

So John 16.8,9. [*He will reprove the world of sin.* —— (not only in general that they are sinners, but of this sin *in specie*) *because they believed not in me.*]

Many texts may be cited where justifying faith and condemning unbelief are described from acts of the understanding (though the will be implyed) as *believing, or not believing that Christ is the Son of God*, &c. which cannot possibly be restrained to his Ransom and Merit alone.

The Consequence cannot be denyed, if it be but understood that this unbelief doth thus *specially* condemn, not in general as sin, or by the meer greatness of it, but as the privation of that faith by which only men are justified. For Privatives shew what the Positives are. And if this unbelief did condemn only as a sin in general, then all sin would condemn as it doth: but that is false. And if it condemned only as a great sin, then first, every sin as great would condemn as it doth; and secondly, it would be Derogatory to the preciousness and power of the Remedy, which is sufficient against the greatest sins, as great: It remains therefore that as it is not for the special worth of faith above all other Graces, that God assigned it to be the condition of Justification; so it is not for a special greatness in the sin of unbelief that it is the specially condemning sin, but as it is the Privation of that faith (which because of its peculiar aptitude to that Office, is made of such necessity to our Justification.

But saith Mr, *Blake* ["*This is like the old Argument: Evil* "*works merit condemnation: therefore good Works merit salvati-* "*on. An ill meaning damns our good meaning; therefore saves.*]

Repl. First, A palpable mistake. Meriting, and saving by merit, are effects or efficiencies so plainly separable from the things themselves, that the invalidity of the Consequence easily appears: But in good sadness, did you believe when you wrote this, that he that argueth from the description or nature of a privation,

vation, to the description or nature of the thing, of which it is the Privation, or that argueth from the Law of opposites and contradictions, doth argue like him that argues from the moral separable efficiency, or effect of the one, to the like efficiency or effect of the other?

Secondly. But understand me to argue from the effect it self, if you please; so it be as affixed by the unchangeable Law or Covenant of God: I doubt not but the Argument will hold good. As under the Law of works it was a good argument to say, *Not-perfect-obeying is the condemning evil: therefore perfect-obeying is the justifying condition.*] So is it a good argument under the Covenant of Grace to say, *Not-believing in Christ as King, Priest and Prophet, is the specially-condemning unbelief; therefore believing in Christ as King, Priest & Prophet, is the faith by which we are justified*] The main force of the reason lyeth here, because else the Covenant were equivocating, and not Intelligible, if when it saith [*He that believeth shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned*] it did speak of one kind or act of faith in one Proposition, and of another in the other. If when it is said, [*He that believeth shall be justified from all things*, &c. and *he that believeth not shall be condemned*] [*if you believe you shall not come into condemnation; but if you believe not, you are condemned, and the wrath of God abideth on you*] [*He that believeth shall be forgiven, and he that believeth not shall not be forgiven*] I say, if the Affirmative and Negative Propositions, the Promise and the Threatning do not here speak of the same believing, but divers, then there is no hope that we should understand them, and the language would necessitate us to err. Now the Papists Argument *ab effectis* hath no such bottom; *Bad works damn, therefore good works save.* For the Covenant is not [*He that doth good works shall be saved, and he that doth bad works shall be condemned*] But [*he that obeyeth perfectly shall be justified, and he that doth not shall be condemned*] Or if they argue from the threatning of the Gospel against bad works, to the merit of good, *quoad modum procurandi*, it will not hold, *viz.* that *Evil works procure damnation by way of merit: therefore good works procure salvation by way of merit.* For there is not *eadem ratio*, and so no ground for the Consequence; Nor did I argue *ad modum procurandi*,]

curandi,] *Rejecting Christ as King doth condemn by way of merit; therefore accepting him as King doth save by Way of merit*]This was none of my arguing: But this [*Rejecting or not believing in Christ as King, is part of that Unbelief which is by the Law of Grace, threatned with condemnation: therefore accepting or believing in Christ as King, is part of that faith which hath the Promise of Justification*] And so if a Papist should argue, not *ad modum procurandi*, but *ad naturam actus & effecti*; I would justifie his Argument [*Raigning sin, Rebellion, or the absence of Evangelical good Works, is Threatned by the Gospel with condemnation at Judgement: therefore good works have the Promise of salvation, or justification at Judgement.*]

And that I may and must thus understand the Condemning Threatning, and the Justifying promise, to speak of one and the same faith, I am assured by this: because it is usual with God in scripture to imply the one in the other. As in the Law of works with perfect ma ,the promise was not expreft, but implyed in the Threatning [*In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die.*] So in the Gospel the Threatning is oft implyed in the promise [*He that believeth shall not perish*] When the Lord saith [*The soul that sinneth shall die*] It implyeth that [*the soul that sinneth not shall not die.*] And though we cannot say the like of the prohibition of *Eating* the forbidden fruit, that is, because the same Law did on the same terms prohibite all other sin as well as it. And [*in the day that thou sinnest, thou shalt die*] doth imply [*if thou sin not, thou shalt not die.*] So [*he that believeth, shall be saved,*] doth imply, *he that believeth not, shall be condemned.* And so, *If thou believe, thou shalt be justified,* implyeth, *If thou believe not, thou shalt not be justified.* If you consent not to this, you then must maintain that this Covenant excludeth not Infidels from salvation, the term *only* being not implyed in the promise of pardon to *Believers*: But if you grant all this, (as sure you will) then it is most evident that *Believing* is taken in the same sense in the promise, and in the threatning: For no man breathing can tell me, either how a Promise to one kind of faith, can imply a threatning against the want of another kind or act of faith; or else what that other faith must be that is so implyed, if not the same. And

if

if it be the same faith that is implyed (which is a most evident truth) then it will follow, that if I prove the Threatned unbelief to be a Rejecting of Christ as King, the faith then that is made the condition of the promise, must be the accepting of him as King as well as Priest. But I have proved that not believing in Christ as King, is part of the unbelief that is specially threatned with condemnation: therefore believing in him as King is part of that faith which hath the promise, or is the Condition of Justification.

But saith Mr. *Blake*, [*I further answer, Rejecting Christ as King, is a sin against the moral Law, which damns: Yet somewhat more then subjection to the Moral Law is required that a sinner may be saved*]

Repl. For my part, I know no Law but moral Law. Its a strange Law that is not Moral, as it is a strange *Animal* that is not *quid Physicum*. But yet I partly understand what some others mean by the phrase *Moral Law*; but what you mean I cannot tell, for all your two volumns. And its to small purpose to dispute upon terms whose sense we be not agreed in, nor do not understand one another in: And you must better agree with yourselves before you agree with me: I cannot reconcile *these speeches*.

Mr. *Blake* of the Covenant, *pag.* 111. { *I know no other Rule but the old Rule: the Rule of the Moral Law: that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.*

Mr. *Blake* here. *pag.* 563. { *Yet somewhat more then subjection to the Moral Law is required, that a sinner may be saved.*

I am confident you will allow me to think you mean somewhat more *ex parte nostri*, and not only *ex parte Christi*: And can that *somewhat more* be required without any Rule requiring it? And yet I find you sometimes seeming offended with me, for telling you I understand you not.

But I further answer you: The rejecting of Christ as King, is no further a sin against the Moral Law, then the accepting him as King, is a duty of the Moral Law. Will you not believe this without a Dispute, when you are told by *Paul*, that *where there is no Law, there is no transgression*, and elsewhere that *sin is a*

transgression of the Law? And need not stand to prove that the same Law which is the Rule prescribing duty, is the Rule discovering sin, even that sin which is the Privation of that duty. I desire no Readers that will not receive these things without any more arguing.

Mr. *Blake* adds [*"Unbelief, if We speak properly, doth not at all condemn, further then as it is a breath of a Moral commandment. The privation of which you speak, only holds the sentence of the Law in force and power against us: which me thinks should be your judgement as well as mine, seeing you are wont to compare the new Law (as you call it) to an act of oblivion: And an act of oblivion saves many, but condemns none. ——"*]

Repl. It is in more then one thing I perceive that we differ. But this is a truth that you must not so easily take out of our hands. Though having had occasion to speak largely of it elsewhere, I shall say but little now.

First, Again, I know no Commandment that is not moral. But if you mean by *Moral* the Commandment either meerly as delivered by *Moses*, or as written in Nature; I am not of your mind, nor ever shall be. To be void of the belief of these Articles of the faith [*that this Jesus is the Christ, that he was actually conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin* Mary, *suffered under* Pontius Pilate, *was crucified, dead and buried: Rose again the third day, ascended into Heaven; sitteth in our nature at the right hand of God; gave the Holy Ghost to his Apostles to confirm the Doctrine of the Gospel*] with many more; doth condemn further then as it is a breach either of the Mosaical or Natural Law: yea in some respects as it is no breach of those Laws.

And yet the same sin materially may be a breach of several Laws; and condemned by several.

Secondly you very much mistake my judgement here, if you think it the same with yours: Nor will the mention of an act of oblivion justifie your mistake. I suppose an Act of oblivion may possibly have a Penalty anexed, (as, that all that stand our, and accept not of this pardon by such a year or day, shall be remediless, and lyable to a greater Penalty,) And I think if no Penalty be named, there is one implyed.

For

For my part, I am satisfied that the Remedying Law or the Law of Grace, hath its special Threatning, when I so often read it, [*He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*] and [*unless ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*] And I take it to differ from the Threatning of the law of works, thus.

First, In the matter of the condition: which is not sin in general; any sin: but a *special* sin, *viz.* the final rejecting the Remedy; that is, Refusing to turn to God by faith in Christ.

Secondly, In the Penalty: First, The Gospel Penalty, is Non-liberation from the curse of the Law. Not to be forgiven or saved. This had been but a Negation, and not Penal, if there had been no Christ and Gospel: But it is a privation and penal, now, because by a special sin, we forfeit our hopes and possibilities. Secondly, As to the degree, I find it will be a far sorer punishment, *Heb.* 10. 29. The Law of greatest Grace doth threaten the greatest punishment. Thirdly, And doubtless in Hell, Conscience will have a special kind of Accusations and self tormentings, in reflecting on the refusals of the remedy, and treading under foot the blood of the new Covenant; which is a punishment that was never threatned by the Covenant of works. Fourthly, And there will be a Privation of a greater Glory, then ever was promised under the Law of works. Fifthly, As also of a special sort of eternal felicity, consisting in loving the Redeemer, and singing the song of the Lamb, and being his members, *&c.*

Thirdly, And as there are these five differences in the Penalty, besides that of the Condition of it, so is there a considerable modal difference in the consummation it self. *viz.* that of the Law of works was not peremptory, excluding a Remedy; but the Threatning of the Law of Grace is peremptory, excluding all further Remedy to all Eternity: which I think is a most weighty difference. I know, this is not much pertinent to our present Controversie; but you have made it necessary for me thus to touch it: But I shall not digress now to prove it to those that see it not by its own light: But I must say, that if I should be drawn by you to deny it, I should have but a

ſtrange Method of Theology in my underſtanding, and ſhould think I let open the door to more Errors then a few.

So much for the proof of the *Theſis*.

The Principal work is yet behind, which is to confute the Arguments of the Opponents. I call it the Principal work, becauſe it is incumbent on them to prove, who make the limitation and reſtriction, and add a new propoſition to the Doctrine of the Goſpel: and till they have proved this propoſition, our ground is good; we ſay that [*Believing in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is the faith by which we are juſtified* [and this is paſt denyal in the Scriptures. They ſay, that [*Believing in him as a Ranſom and Purchaſer, or apprehending his Righteouſneſs is the only act of faith by which we are juſtified,*] and not alſo Believing in him as Lord, Teacher, Interceſſor, *&c.* When they have proved the reſtriction and excluſion, as well as we prove our Aſſertion that excludeth no eſſential part of faith, then the work is done, and till then they have done nothing.

And firſt, before I come to their Arguments, I ſhall conſider of that great Diſtinction, which containeth much of their opinion, and which is the principall Engine to deſtroy all our Arguments for the contrary. And it is to this purpoſe.

["*Believing in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt as King, Teacher,*] &c. *is the* "fides quæ Juſtificat, *but it juſtifieth not* qua talis; *but* qua fides "in Chriſtum ſatisfacientem, *&c.* Fides qua Juſtificat, *muſt be* "*diſtinguiſhed from* fides quæ Juſtificat. *A man that hath eyes* "*doth hear, and that hath ears doth ſee; but he heareth not as he* "*hath eyes, but as he hath ears; and he ſeeth not as he hath ears,* "*but as he hath eyes. So faith which believeth in Chriſt as King* "*doth juſtifie, but not* qua talis, *as it believeth in him as King, but* "*as it believeth in him, or apprehendeth him as our Righteouſneſs.*

Repl. As juſt and neceſſary Diſtinction riddeth us out of the fruitleſs perplexity of confuſed diſputings; ſo unſound Diſtinctions, eſpecially with ſeeming ſubtilty, are Engines to deceive and lead us into the dark. The laſt time I anſwered this Diſtinction, I was ſo improvident as to ſay, that, it [*it is the general cheat,*] meaning no more then *a Fallacy*, and thinking the word had ſignified no worſe: But Mr. *Blake* publiſheth this Comment on that ſyllable [*And as it ſeems you have met with a pack of Impoſtors,*

postors, and that of the most Learned in the Land, that out of their great Condescension have written for your satisfaction. This word you think sounds harshly from Mr. Crandon, *as indeed it doth, and is no small blemish to his great pains; you may then judge how it will sound from your self in the ears of others.*

Such insinuations, as if it were to breed dissention between those Learned Brethren and my self, are not fair dealing. First, I do not remember one or two at most of all those Brethren, that in their Papers to me used that distinction! How then can you tell the world in print, that it seems I have met with a pack of Impostors, even them you mention? Did you ever see my Papers, or theirs? Did they ever tell you that this distinction is in them? I solemnly profess it was not in my thoughts so much as to intimate that any one of their Papers was guilty of that distinction. But if you will say so, what remedy But perhaps I intimate so much in my words; In what words? when I say, that [*all that I have to do with, grant the Antecedent*] and whats that to the question in hand? many a hundred may grant that this act is the *fides qua*, that assert not the other act to be the *fides quâ*, and allow not the use of the distinction which I resist. But perhaps its my next words that imply it [*For the general cheat is by the distinction of fides qua and qua*, &c.] But sure it cannot be understood, that its general with al the world, nor general as to all that I have had to do with: There is no such thing said or meant by me; for then it must extend to all that are of my own mind: and I told Mr. *Blake* enough of the contrary as to the persons he mentioneth, by telling *him* how they owned not the Instrumentality of faith, and then they cannot well maintain this use of this distinction. It is the general deceit or cheat of all that are deceived by it; and of most that in this point oppose me. But if Mr. *Blake* think either that all that vouchsafe me their writings, do it by way of oppositon (when many do it but by explication and reconciliation) or that all that oppose me, do oppose me in that point, he thinks no truer then here he writes.

Secondly. And as he feigneth me to speak of many reverend persons that I never meant, so he feigneth me to take them actually for Impostors, because I take the distinction for a cheat.

But

But is it not possible that it may cheat or deceive themselves, though some never utter it to the deceiving of others? Much less as impostors with an intention to deceive: I would you had never learned this art of confutation.

Thirdly, But I perceive how you would take it if I had applyed this to your self. And what is this, but plainly to forbid me to dispute with you? (which I had never done on other terms then for Defence.) Can I not tell you that your Argument is a Fallacy, but you will thus exclaim of me, as making you an Impostor? why then if you be so tender, who may deal with you? On the same grounds, if I say that your Major or Minor is false, you may tell the world I make you a Lyar; and I must either say as you say, or let you alone; lest by contradiction I make you a Lyar or an Impostor. Prove that ever I blamed Mr. *Crandon* for such a passage as this, if you can. It is not [*this word*] thus applyed, but other words that I excepted against; I will not yet believe it all one to call an Argument or distinction a *cheat* or *fallacy*, and to call the person a Cheater and Deceiver, and that designedly, as purposely dissembling his Religion.

Mr. *Blake* proceeds. [*And I much marvel that this distinction, that every where else would pass, and be confessed to be of* "*necessity, to avoid confusion in those distinct capacities in which* "*men usually act, should here not alone be questioned, but thus* "*branded. Does not every man that undergoes various relations,* "*variously act according to them? And do not men that make ad-* "*dress, address themselves in like variety? He that is at once a* "*Husband, a Parent, a Master, a School-master, a Physician, acts* "*variously according to all of these capacities. Some come to him* "*as a Father, some as a Master, some as a Teacher; all of them* "*come to him as a Physician: But only they that come to him as* "*a Physician are cured by him. Believers through faith go to* "*Christ that bears all the Relations mentioned. But as they seek* "*satisfaction in his blood-shedding, which is an act of his Priest-* "*hood, they are justified.*]

Repl. I ever granted that we are justified by trusting in Christs blood: But not [*only*] by that.

Secondly, It was God that sought satisfaction in Christs blood,

blood, the Believer seeks for the fruit of that satisfaction.

Thirdly, But now to the distinction, I shall tell you freely my thought of it, and the reasons of my resisting your use of it, and then answer your reasons for it.

And first, We must understand what it is that is distinguished: whether the Habit of faith, or the Acts? As far as I am able to understand them, they that understand themselves, do intend to distinguish of the Habit by a virtual distinction, and their meaning is [*The Habit of Faith which produceth both these acts doth justifie: but not as it produceth the act of believing in Christ as Lord, Teacher*, &c. *but as it produceth the Act of believing in his blood*] that is, [*The habit is the remote cause, and the act is the nearer cause; and the habit justifieth by this Act, and not by the other.*] I verily think this is their meaning; I am sure this is the most probable and rational that I can imagine. But then first, This contradicteth their ordinary assertion, that it is not the Habit of faith, but the act by which we are justified. Secondly, Then they do not mean that the act of believing in Christ as Lord, *&c.* is so much as the *fides qua*, which if they will speak out and make no more ado, the controversie will be much better understood. For then it is a question thats easily apprehended, *Whether only the act of faith in Christs satisfaction do justifie, or the believing in Christ as King, Priest and Prophet, or all that is essential to Christian faith*] This is a plain case; which *fides qua* and *qua* do not illustrate.

But then I must add, that this begs the question as used by them, but decideth it not. And as [*qua*] respecteth but the Matter of the condition; q. d. *The habit as it produceth this act, and not that, is the condition of Justification*] (for else it justificth neither *as* it produceth the one or the other,) so it is the very Question between us, Whether it be one act, or the whole essence of the Christian faith that is the Condition?

And this supposeth the determination of other controversies that are not yet determined. There are three opinions of the Habit of faith. First, that the several acts of faith, have several habits. Secondly, that the divers acts have but one habit of faith distinct from the habits of other graces. Thirdly, That

faith, love, and all graces have but one habit. If the first hold, then the distinction as before explained, hath no place. If the last hold, then the Habit of Love, or Fear, may be on the same ground, said to justifie.

If I have before hit on their meaning, then the distinction of the Habit is *virtualis*, and the distinction of the acts is *realis*, and they totally exclude all acts, save that which they fix upon; not from being present, but from a co-interest. But from what interest? Of a Cause? that we deny even to all: Of a Condition? that they grant to these which they exclude.

Next, we must understand the members of their Distinction: And sometime they express one branch to be [*fides qua justificat*] and sometime [*fides qua apprehendit Christum satisfacientem*, &c.] As to the former, it cannot be contradistinct from [*faith in Christ as Lord*,] but from faith as *sanctifying*, &c. it being but a denominative or virtual distinction of one and the same faith, from the several consequents. And so I easily grant that *fides qua justificat, non sanctificat vel glorificat*, and so of all the consequents of it. As it is the condition of one, it is not the condition of the other: which is no more, then to say that there is between the consequents *Distinctio realis*, from whence the Antecedent (Really the same) may be denominatively or virtually distinguished: As the same man that goeth before a hundred particular men, hath a hundred distinct Relations to them, as *Before* them all. The very same condition in a free Gift, may be the condition of many hundred benefits, and accordingly be Relatively and denominatively distinguished; when yet it is as truly the condition of all as of one, and hath equal interest as to the procurement.

And as for the other phrase that [*fides qua recipit Christum satisfacientem, justificat*,] properly it is false Docrine; if *qua* signifie the neerest Reason of faiths interest in procuring Justification; for then it is but to say that [*fides, qua fides, justificat*] which is false. The denomination and the description express but the same thing; *fides* is the denomination; and *Receptio Christi* is the description: if therefore it justifie *qua Receptio Christi*, then it justifieth *qua fides*, that is, *qua hæc fides in specie*: which is to ascribe it to the τὸ *credere* with a witness. And elsewhere

where I have disproved it by many Arguments.

But if *qua* be taken less properly, as denoting only the aptitude of faith to be the condition of Justification, then still the Question is begged. For we say, that as the act of believing in Christs blood-shed hath a special aptitude in one respect, so the act of believing in his Resurrection, Intercession, *&c.* and receiving him as King, Teacher, *&c.* hath a special aptitude in other respects, upon which God hath certainly made them the Conditions of our Justification with the other.

But if any should distinguish of the act of faith, and not the Habit, and say that [*fides quæ credit in Christum ut Regem, justificat, sed non quâ credit in Christum ut Regem*] I accept the former as being all that I desire, and grant the latter: But then I say the like of the other act of faith, that [*fides quâ credit in Christum satisfacientem non justificat*, because *fides quâ fides, non justificat, sed fides quâ conditio præstita.*] And I think I need to say no more for the opening the Fallacy, that this distinction useth to cover.

And now I come to peruse all that I can find that is produced to support this distinction. And the most is certain pretended similitudes, that have little or no similitude as to this.

The common similitude is [*A man that is* oculatus *heareth, but not* qua oculatus, *but* qua auritus, &c.] Repl. First, If you take *quâ* strictly, the affirmative is not true. For then *àquatenus ad omne*, every man that is *auritus* would hear: whereas he may stop his ears, and be where is no sound, *&c.* And a man that hath eyes may wink, and be in the dark, *&c.* Secondly, If *quâ* signifie the aptitude, or causal interest, I deny the similitude; It is *dissimile*: and the reason of the difference is evident; for a mans eyes are Physical efficient causes of his sight, and his ears of hearing; naturally in their aptitude and potentiality determined to their proper objects: but faith is no efficient cause of our Justification, or of our interest in Christ at all; much less a Physical efficient cause. But the Interest it hath is Moral, which dependeth on the Donors will; and it is no higher then that of a condition: and therefore the act that Physically hath least respect to the object, may in this case if the Donor

pleaſe, do as much to procure a Title to it, as that which hath the neareſt phyſical reſpect to it. As if you have a deed of Gift of a Countrey on Condition you will diſcover a Traitor, or marry one that oweth it: here the alien act hath more intereſt in procuring your Title, then your *Apprehending*, or treading on the ſoil, or taking poſſeſſion, yea or accepting the deed of Gift it ſelf. So God hath made our Accepting of whole Chriſt to be the condition of life and pardon; and conſequently, the Accepting him in other Relations (in which he deſtroyeth ſin, advanceth God, *&c.*) doth as much to our Juſtification as the accepting him at our Ranſome.

Now to Mr. *Blakes* Reaſons: when he ſaith that *this diſtinction would paſs every where elſe as neceſſary*, he is much miſtaken: for as he doth not tell us at all what ſort of diſtinction it is, whether *Realis*, *Rationis*, *Modalis*, *Formalis*, *Virtualis*, &c. ſo I could give him an hundred inſtances in which it will not paſs in any tolerable ſenſe, but what are his own ſelect inſtances, from a mans various Relations to the variety of his actions and their effects. But is it Chriſt or the believer that you put in theſe various Relations? Its plain that you mean Chriſt: But thats nothing to the queſtion: I maintain as well as you that Chriſt performeth variety of works, according to the divers parts of his office, and that he meriteth not Juſtification as King, but as a Sacrifice; as he effectively juſtifieth, not as a ſacrifice, but as a King; and he teacheth as a Teacher, *&c.* this was never denyed by me. But the queſtion is whether the Intereſt of the ſeveral acts of our faith be accordingly diſtinct? which I deny, and *confidently* deny. In the works that Chriſt doth in theſe ſeveral Relations, there is *diſtinctio realis*, and Chriſt is the proper efficient cauſe of them. But though our faith muſt accept Chriſt in all theſe Relations, and to do the ſeveral works in the ſeveral Relations, yet it is no proper cauſe of the effects, and (as I ſaid) the intereſt it hath in the procurement is meerly moral, and that but of a condition, and therefore it is to be judged of by the will of the Donor.

But you ſay that [*only they that come to Chriſt as a Phyſician are cured by him*] Repl. Very true: I never denyed it: But not only *By coming to him as a Phyſitian*; eſpecially as the Worker of this one part of the cure. You

You add [*Believers through faith go to Christ that beareth all "the Relations mentioned: But as they seek satisfaction in his blood-shedding, they are justified.*] Repl. Very true (if by *as* you understand only the aptitude of the act to its office, and the certain connexion of the effect: otherwise it is not as they believe at all that they are justified;) but it is not only as they seek satisfaction in his blood; but also as they believe in him as King, Teacher, Rising, Interceding, &c. Though it be Christs blood, and not his Dominion, that Ransometh us; yet his promise giveth the fruit of that blood as well on the condition of believing in him as King, as of the believing in his blood. Hitherto we have come short of your proofs, which next we shall proceed to, and freely examine.

Mr. Blake. *I shall take the bodlness to give in my Arguments, to make good that faith in Christ* qua *Lord, doth not justifie.*

First, That which the types under the law, appointed for atonement and expiation, lead us unto in Christ, our faith must eye for atonement, expiation, and reconciliation; this cannot be denyed: These Levitical Types lead us doubtless to a right object, being Schoolmasters to lead us unto Christ, and shaddows whereof he is the substance: As also to that office in him (who is the object of faith) which serves for that work: But these types lead us to Christ in his Priestly office, for the most part as sacrificing, sometime as interceding, John 1. 29. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. *A great part of the Epistle to the* Heb. *is a proof of it.*]

Reply I grant you both Major and Minor: but the question is a meer stranger to the Just conclusion. First, it will not follow, because our faith must eye Christ as Priest for Reconciliation, that therefore it must eye him only as Priest for Reconciliation. And if *only* be not in, your exclusion of other acts of faith follows not.

Secondly, No, nor if it were in neither: for *ex parte Christi* for Reconciliation *only* Christs Priesthood is to be eyed as the meritorious cause (speaking in their sense that take the priestly office to comprehend not only Christ as Sacrificer, but as sacrifice, yea & as obeying in the form of a servant, the fitness whereof I now pass by:) but *ex parte nostri*, the so eying him is not the *only* act of faith by which we are justified: so that *for* is ambigu-

ous: and either signifieth Christs procurement of our Justification, or *ours*: In the former sense I grant as aforesaid, these Types shew us that Christ *only* as Priest and sacrifice doth satisfie for us. But as to the procuring *Interest* of our faith, these Types shew us not that *only* this act procureth our Interest. Nor is there a word in the texts you mention to prove any such thing: *Jo.* 1. 19. saith that, Christ [*the Lamb of God taketh away the sin of the world*,] but it doth not say that only believing in him as the Lamb of God is the faith upon which we have part in his blood. and are justified by him. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18. tels us we *were Redeemed by his precious blood*; but it doth not tell us that only believing in that blood is the faith by which we have interest in it; but contrarily thus describes that faith, *ver.* 21. [*Who by him do believe in God that raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God.*] 2. *Cor.* 5. 21. tells us that *he was made sin for us*, &c. but it saith not that our believing thus much only, is the full condition of our Interest in his Righteousness; But contrarily expresseth it by [*our own being reconciled to God*] to which *Paul* exhorteth.

Thirdly, The Types which you mention, were not all the Gospel (or Covenant of Grace, or Promise) then extant: If therefore there were any other parts of Gods word then, that led them to Receive Christ entirely as the *Messiah*, and particularly as the King and Teacher of his Church, and promised life and pardon on this condition, your Argument then from the Types alone is vain; because they were not the whole word (unless you prove that they exclude the rest, which you never can.) And indeed not only the very first promise of the seed of the woman, *&c.* doth hold out whole Christ as Priest, and Prophet and King, as the object of justifying faith, but also many and many another in the old Testament. And the Epistle to the *Hebrews* which you cite, doth begin with his Kingly office as the object of our faith in the two first chapters, which are almost all taken up in proving it.

Fourthly, you confess your self that Christ as *Interceding* is the object of justifying faith; and if you mean it of his Heavenly intercession; that was no part of his meritorious obedience or humiliation. Its true indeed, that it is for the applica-

tion

tion or Collation of the fruits of his blood, and so is much of his Kingly and Prophetical office too.

Mr. Blake. [*Secondly, That which the Sacraments under the Gospel, setting forth Christ for pardon of sin, lead us unto, that our faith must eye for Reconciliation, Pardon and Justification. This is clear. Christ in his own instituted ordinances will not misguide us; But these lead us to Christ suffering, dying for the pardon of sin,* Mat 26 28. —— *A broaken, bleeding, dying Christ in the Lords Supper is received.*

Reply, First, I hope you would not make the world believe that I deny it; Did I ever exclude a dying Christ from the object of justifying faith? But what strange Arguments are these, that are such strangers still to the question? yon prove the inclusion of [*faith in Christ dying*,] but do not so much as mention the exclusion of the other acts of faith, which is the thing that was incumbent on you.

Secondly, If you say that [*only*] is meant by you, though not expressed, then I further reply, that this Argument labouring of the same disease with the last, requireth no other answer. First, The Sacraments being not the whole Gospel, you cannot prove your *Exclusion* from them, unless you prove somewhat *exclusive* in them (which you attempt not, that I see,) Secondly, If therefore you understand the Minor exclusivel y as to all other parts of Christs office, I deny it, and the texts cited say not a word to prove it. Thirdly, And if they did, yet faith may eye a dying Christ only as purchasing Pardon; and yet *ex parte Christi* that act that so eyeth him may not be the only act that is the condition of our Title to a dying Christ or to the pardon purchased. Fourthly, And yet (though it would not serve your turn) even *ex parte Christi*, your exclusion is so far from being proved that its contradicted both by the Sacraments and by Scriptures: much more *ex parte nostri*, your *excusion* of the other acts of faith. For, First, In Baptism its apparent (which is appointed for our solemn initiation into a state of Justification; which the Lords Supper is not.) First, Christ foundeth it in his Dominion, *Mat.* 28. 18. *All power is given to me in Heaven and Earth; go ye therefore* &c. Secondly, He maketh the very nature of it to be an entering men into a state of Disciples, and so engaging them

to

to him as their Master, *ver.* 19. *Go ye therefore and Disciple* (*or teach*) *all Nations, baptizing them.* Thirdly, The words of the Jews to *John* (*If thou be not that Christ nor* Elias, *nor that Prophet, why baptizest thou?* John 1. 25.) and their flocking to his baptism, and the words of *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. (*I thank God that I baptized none of you,* —— *lest any should say, that I baptized in my own name*) do plainly shew that baptizing was then taken, as an entering into a state of Disciples. And I have before proved that baptism doth list us under Christ the Commander, King and Master of the Church. Fourthly, And therefore the Church hath ever baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with an abrenunciation of the flesh the world and the devil, not only as opposite to Christs blood, but as opposites to his Kingdom and Doctrine. Fifthly, And the very water signifieth the spirit of Christ as well as his blood: Though I think not, as Mr. *Mead*, that it signifieth the spirit only. Sixthly, And our coming from under the water was to signifie our Resurrection with Christ, as *Rom.* 6. shews. So that it is certain that Christ in all parts of his office is propounded in baptism to be the object of our faith, and this baptism comprizing all this, is said to be [*for the Remission of sin.*]

Secondly, And though the Lords supper suppose us justified, yet he understandeth not well what he doth, that thinks that Christ only as dying is there propounded to our faith. For, First, In our very receiving we profess Obedience to Christ as King, that hath enjoyned it by his Law. Secondly, And to Christ our Teacher that hath taught us thus to do. Thirdly, The signs themselves are a visible word (of Christ our Teacher) and teach us his sufferings, promises, our duty, *&c.* Fourthly, By taking, eating, and drinking, we renew our Covenant with Christ; And that Covenant is made with him not only as Priest, but as the Glorified Lord and King of the Church. On his part the thing promised which the Sacrament sealeth, is, (not that Christ will dye for us, for that's done already, but) that Christ will actually pardon us on the account of his merits. And this he doth as King: and that he will sanctifie, preserve, strengthen, and glorifie us: all which he doth as King, though he purchased them as a sacrifice. On our part we deliver up our selves to him

to

to be wholly his; even his Disciples, and Subjects, as well as pardoned ones. Fifthly, Yea the very bread and wine eaten and drank do signifie our spiritual Union and Communion with Jesus, who is pleased to become one with us, as that bread and wine is one with our substance. And surely it is to Christ as our Head that we are United, and not only as dying for us: and as to our Husband, who is most dearly to be loved by us, and is to rule us, and we to be subject to him, being made bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh; *Ephe.* 5. 23,24,25,30. Sixthly, We are to do it as in remembrance of his death, so also in expectation of his *comming*, which will be in Kingly Glory, when he will drink with us the fruit of the Vine new in the Kingdome of his Father.

Object. But Christ doth not pardon sin in all these respects. *Answ.* First. But in the Sacrament he is represented to be believed in entirely in all these respects. Secondly, And he pardoneth as King, though he merit it as a sacrifice. And as his Sacrifice and Merit are the cause of all that following, so therefore it is specially represented in the Sacrament, not excluding but including the rest. Thirdly, Believing in Christ as King and Prophet, even as his offices respect his Honor and our sanctity, may be as truly the condition of our Justification, as believing in his blood.

Mr. Blake. *As the spirit of God guides faith, so it must go to God for propitiation and attonement. But the Holy Ghost guids faith to go to the blood of Christ for attonement*, *Rom.* 3.25. & 5.9. *Eph.* 1.7. 1 *John.* 1.7.

Reply. *Concedo totum*: The conclusion can be but this [*therefore faith must go to the blood of Christ for attonement*] Who ever qnestioned this! But your Thesis which you set at the Head of your Arguments, was [*Faith in Christ* qua *Lord doth not justifie*] which is little kin to any of your Arguments.

But in the explication, you have here, at last, the term *Only*, and therefore I may take that to be supposed in the Argument; But then with that Addition, I deny your Minor. The texts mentioned say nothing to prove it.

Rom. 3. 25. hath no *only* in it, nor any thing exclusive of the other acts of Christ: And if it had, yet it would not follow

that all other acts of our faith were excluded. As his blood is the meritorious cause, and so the foundation of all the benefits, and so all the Applying Causes are supposed in the mention of it, and not excluded, so are all other acts of our faith in the mention of that act.

Rom. 5.9. saith not that we are justified *only* by his blood. Nor is it any adding to the Scripture, to add more, unless you can prove that these texts are the whole Scripture, or that the other Scriptures add no more.

Ephe. 1.7. and 1 *John* 1.7. do neither of them exclude either the other acts of Christ, or other acts of faith: Nay *John* seems to make somewhat else the condition on our part, then the belief in that blood only, when he saith there [*If we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin*] Or if you think this [*if*] denoteth but a sign, yet other texts will plainly prove more.

To conclude, If I were to go only to the blood of Christ for atonement, yet it would not follow, that going to that blood only for it, is the *only* act of Faith on which Justification is promised or given me in the Gospel, as is before declared.

Mr. Blake. *You demand,* [*Will you exclude his Obedience, Resurrection, Intercession*]? *To which I only say, I marvell at the question: If I exclude these, I exclude his blood: His shedding of blood was in Obedience,* John 10.18. Phil. 2.8. *his Resurrection was his freedom from the bands of death, and an evidence of our discharge by blood: His Intercession is founded on his blood. He intercedes not as we by bare petition, but by merit: He presents his blood as the high Priest in the Holy of Holies.*

Repl. It was the thing I had to do, to prove that *Rom.* 3.24. and those other texts, are not exclusive of all but his blood, and that the word *Only* is no more meant, then it is expressed in them. And now you grant it me: And needs must do it, while Scripture tells us, that *by the Obedience of one, many are made Righteous,* Rom. 5.19. *and that he is Risen for our Justification,* Rom. 4.25. and that *Righteousness shall be imputed to us, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.* ver. 24.

and

and *It is God that justifieth : who is he that condemneth ? it is Christ that dyed, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God ; who also maketh Intercession for us, Rom* 8 33, 34. he that believeth all these texts will not add *only* to the first, at least if he understand them; for they do not contradict each other. Well ! but you marvell at my question ! I am glad of that ! Are we so well agreed, that you marvell at my supposition of this difference ? To satisfie you, my question implyed this Argument. If the Resurrection, Intercession, *&c.* be not in those texts excluded, nor faith in them, then we may not add *only* to interpret them ; but *&c.* Ergo.

But let us hear the reasons of your marveling. First, As to Obedience, you say *His shedding of blood was in Obedience.* Answer. But though all blood-shed was in Obedience, yet all Obedience was not by blood-shed, nor suffering neither. And the text *Rom.* 5.19. seems to speak of Obedience as Obedience, and not only as in blood shed.

Secondly, You say *His Resurrection was his freedom*, &c. *Anf.* But Suffering is one thing, and freedom from suffering is another thing. Therefore faith to our justification must eye Christs conquest and freedom from death as well as his death it self. Moreover, Resurrection was an act of Power, and his Entrance on his Kingdom, and not a meer act of Priesthood : Nor will you ever prove that faith (to Justification) must only look at the Resurrection as connoting the death from which he riseth.

Thirdly, You say , *His Intercession is founded on his blood*, &c. *Answer.* So is his Kingdom and Lordship, *Rom.* 14 9. *Mat.* 28.18. *Phil.* 2.9,10. It seems then faith in order to Justification must not only look at Christs blood, but that which is founded on it. His Government, in Legislation , Judgement , Execution, is all founded in his blood. *&c.* because *he hath drank of the brook in the way , therefore did he lift up the Head*, Psalme 110. 7.

You add *He Interceeds by Merit.* Answer. Not by new purchasing Merit, but by the virtue of his former Merit, and the collation of the effects of it from the Father. And so he Reigneth and Governeth both by virtue of former Merit, and for the applying that Merit and attaining of its Ends.

Whereas therefore you say *If I exclude these, I shall exclude his blood*; It is a weighty Answer. And the like you may say also of his Kingly and Prophetical office. The operation of them are so woven and twisted together by infinite wisdom, that all do harmoniously concur to the attainment of the ends of each one; and if you lay by one, you lay by all; you exclude Christs blood as to the end of Justification, if you include not his Kingly and Prophetical offices, and look not to him as making the Covenant or Grant of pardon in his blood; and as teaching and perswading and working us into Union with himself that we may have part in his blood: and as conferring daily the fruits of his blood as King, in Renewed pardon of daily sins; and as justifying us at Judgement as King and Judge. His blood is a Foundation without a building, if you take it without all these: Overlook these, and you deny it as well as by overlooking his Resurrection.

Besides, *Session at Gods Right Hand* which is one thing that the Apostle instanceth in, *Romans* 8. 35. is his Glorification it self.

And when you say [*He presents his blood as High Priest*, &c.] I answer. But not as a renewed sacrifice, presenting it is not shedding it, or offering it in sacrifice. And the presentation is not a minding God of what he knows not, or hath forgot, or an arguing with him to extort his Mercy; but as the value and merit of Christs sacrifice hath its continual Being before God, so Christ doth give out all his benefits to his Church as procured and received from the Father by the merit of his sacrifice: and this is his Intercession. But your arguing yieldeth, that to Justification, we must not only believe in Christ as shedding his blood for us on earth, but also on Christ as presenting his blood for us in heaven: which is enough to my ends.

Mr. Blake. *You tell me further that the thing I had to prove was not the exclusion of faith in his commands, but of faith in Christ as Lord and Teacher. I can no more distinguish Lord and Command than I can Blood and Sacrifice; it being the office of a Lord to Rule, as of blood to make atonement.*

Repl. First, If you cannot distinguish, there's no remedy but you must err by confusion. Its obvious to an ordinary understanding

derſtanding that even *Blood* and *Sacrifice* may as well be diſtinguiſhed as *Earth and Man*, or *Ink and Writing*; [*Blood*] ſignifying only the matter, yea but part of the matter; and [*a Sacrifice*] ſignifying that matter with its moral Form.

Secondly, And its as obvious that *Lord* and *Command* do otherwiſe differ then *Blood* and *Sacrifice*; for *Lord*, as it ſignifieth principally a Proprietary, is *toto cælo* diſtinct from command, as ſtanding in another *ſeries*: And *Lord* as it ſignifieth a Rector, doth differ from Command, as the efficient from the effect; which is otherwiſe then as part of the matter doth from the whole informed.

It is no Argument againſt the truth which I maintain, that you cannot diſtinguiſh theſe.

Thirdly, If it be *the office of a Lord to Rule*; then you may well diſtinguiſh betwen the office and the work: But indeed in the firſt ſenſe, *Lord* ſignifieth a Proprietary, and but in the ſecond, a Rulers Power; which is not alwayes properly called an Office neither; no more then the Soveraign is properly an Officer.

Fourthly, To make *Atonement* is not all one as to *be a Sacrifice*, which was your former term: for Atonement is the effect of a Sacrifice: not of blood as blood, but as a Sacrifice meritorious and accepted.

Fifthly, And as to the point in difference between us, the difference is palpable and weighty between believing in Chriſt as King, and believing or obeying his Commands. As his Kingly Power belongs to the *Conſtitution* of his myſtical body or Republike, and his commands that flow from it to the *Adminiſtration*: ſo Subjection to his Power and Relation, and conſenting to this conſtitution do enter us into the Body and unite us to him: when believing and obeying his *Laws for Adminiſtration*, do follow as the fruits. If you could have diſtinguiſhed between the Root and Fruits, between Faith and Obedience, between *making Diſciples, and teaching to obſerve*, &c. *Mat.* 28.19,20. *or becoming Diſciples*, and *Learning*; you might have diſtinguiſhed between *becoming a Subject* and *obeying*. And what ever you do I am ſure others of your way do grant, that *Receiving Chriſt as Lord and Teacher*, is the faith that juſtifieth, though not *qua talis*, but they will not ſay ſo by receiving or obeying his

Governing Laws, which are distinct from the constitution or fundamental Law.

Mr. Blake. *You yet tell me it was fittest for* Paul *to say, by faith in his blood; because he intends to connote both what we are justified by* ex parte Christi, *and what we are justified by* ex parte nostri; *but the former principally. To this I say, If this were fittest for* Paul, *then it is unfit for any to come in with Animadversions, and tell us of any other thing* ex parte Christi, *or* ex parte nostri *for Justification. I pray you rest here and we are well agreed. Here is Christs Priestly Office on his part alone, and I am resolved to look no further.*

Repl. Though I may not hope to change you, if you are Resolved, yet I may take leave to render a reason of my contrary as peremptory Resolution: I am resolved to look further *ex parte Christi*, then to his blood, yea or his whole Merit, yea or whole Priest-hood for my Justification; even to whole Christ, and in special to his Regal constitution and sentence. Yet I rest where you desire me, as to the Truth of what I said; and if we are agreed, its better then I can perceive in your other words. First, Though *Paul* there mention the *Priestly office alone*, yet that's not all his Epistles, nor all the Scriptures; nor doth he here exclude the rest.

Secondly, It may be fittest to *Pauls* design in that particular discourse to mention *faith in his blood*, and yet it may be fit for another to come in with animadversions, and tell you of more necessary both *ex parte Christi & nostri*. Its common to express our meaning of a *whole* in a summary notion taken from a chief part: And indeed in Political discourses it is hard to meet with a fitter way of expression.

Thirdly, *Paul* himself was not of your opinion, nor Christ neither, and yet it was not unfit for them to discover it. The same *Paul* that here thought it fittest to mention *faith in his blood*, did elsewhere think it fit to mention *Justification by his Obedience*, and *that he Rose again for our Justification*; and to promise Imputation of Righteousness to us, *if We believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*, Rom. 4.24, 25. with the like passages before mentioned. But most frequently it is the comprehensive phrase of [*believing in Christ Jesus our Lord*] that

that he uſeth. The ſame Chriſt that calleth himſelf ſo of: the Lord and Maſter of his followers, excludeth not thereby his other Relations: And when he ſaith in one place [*I am the Vine*] he may freely ſay elſe where, [*I am the good Shepherd*:] And he that ſpeaketh of *laying down his life for the ſheep*, doth not thereby make it unfit to mention other Paſtoral acts for them. And he that tels us of *eating his fleſh and drinking his blood*, intended not the excluſion of the *ſpirit that quickneth*. I am therefore Reſolved by his Grace to adhere to whole Chriſt as the object of that faith which is the Condition of Juſtification. And I think this full comprehenſive faith is ſafer then the groundleſly diſtinguiſhing faith; and this Doctrine more agreeable *to the* Scriptures.

Mr. *Blake*. Fourthly, *Our faith muſt look on Chriſt ſo as to obtain righteouſneſs by him, by virtue of which We may appear before God as righteous: But it is by his Obedience as a ſervant that We obtain righteouſneſs, and ſtand before God as righteous*, Rom. 5. 19. *by the obedience of one many are made righteous.*

Repl. Firſt, I grant the whole: but its nothing to our Queſtion. Its a ſtrange error that runs through ſo many Arguments, that they ſhould be impertinent to the queſtion. You ſhould have concluded that [*Faith in Chriſt* qua *Lord, doth not juſtifie*] which *in terminis* is the concluſion that you undertook to prove: whereas all that this Argument will conclude, is, that [*our faith muſt look at Chriſts obedience for Righteouſneſs*, &c.] which I have ſaid no more againſt then you have done.

Secondly, But if [*Only*] be implyed as adjoyned to [*obedience*] then it will exclude his ſuffering as ſuffering in that formal reſpect, and take it in only as the Matter of his Obedience.

Thirdly, And by this Argument you deſtroy what you not only mantained, but reſolved to ſtick to in the laſt, that is, that it is not fit for any one to tell us of any other thing then faith in his blood for juſtification, and that you are reſolved to look no further then Chriſts Prieſtly office alone. For Obedience extendeth further then blood ſhed: therefore if we are juſtified by Chriſts whole obedience, then by more then his blood. Yea you will be put hard to it to prove, that all Chriſts obedience was offered by him as a Preiſt to his Father: It belongs to a

Subject,

Subject, a Servant, a Son to obey; but obedience is far from being proper to a Priest.

Fourthly, If you intend the Major exclusively as to all other considerations of the object, I still deny it as false. Our faith (even as the condition of Justification) must look at Christ, *not only* to obtain Righteousness by him, but also to subject our selves to his Teaching and Government, and to glorifie him in and for his Mercy.

Fifthly, Yea, the Minor it self is false, if you imply the exclusive *Only*. For we obtain Righteousness and are justified before God effectively by Christ as King, first by constitution, and secondly, by sentence, as well as meritoriously by Christ as Priest.

Mr. Blake. *Fifthly, That way that Christ took to bring us to God, our faith must eye and follow: But Christ by death the Sacrifice of of himself brings us to God,* 1 Pet. 3. 18. *Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,* &c.

Repl. Still the same error: an *Ignoratio Elenchi*. I grant the whole, but the conclusion's wanting. Did I ever deny that *faith must eye and follow Christs death to bring us to God?* yea for Justification. But you should have said [*by his death alone*] or you say nothing. And when you prove that by his death alone Christ brings us to God, you will do somewhat. And yet if you did, it would not follow that we are brought to God in Justification only by eying the cause of Justification as such.

Mr. Blake. Sixthly, As Christ freeth us from the curse, so he justifies us, and in that notion our faith must look to him for Justification. This is plain; Justification being no other but our acquittal from the curse, which is the sentence of the Law of Moses, *Act.* 13. 8. *but Christ freeth us from the cause in suffering as a Sacrifice, not ruling as a Lord*, Gal. 3. 13. *Christ hath Redeemed us*, &c.

Repl. First, [*Only*] is again left out in the Major proposition, and so I grant it: But if it be implyed that *faith must look to him for Justification only in that notion as he justifieth us, yea only as he meriteth Justification*, then I deny it, and you say nothing to prove it. Secondly, The exclusive of your Minor is a dangerous error: Christ freeth us from the curse by Justifying us as a King, and teaching, and ruling, and sanctifying us; and not only by

by becoming a curse for us: For if you here put in [*Only*] you plainly exclude all his Obedience as such, and much of it materially: for it is not a *cursed* thing to obey God. The Law curseth for disobeying: therefore Obeying is not the Curse, nor is it materially a Curse to Love God, and Trust him, and be zealous for his Glory, *&c.* The whole office of Christ is imployed in freeing us from the Curse: and when *Paul* saith, he was made a Curse to free us, he never said or thought that he did nothing else to free us; for an hundred texts do tell us of more.

Thirdly, And on the by I must say, that I am not of your mind in the description of Justification; for, omitting the controversie whether Justification only free us from the Curse, I do not believe that this curse is only the sentence of the Law of *Moses*. If it were, either you must prove that all the Gentile world that heard not of it was under the Law of *Moses* (which abundance of most Learned men deny with better grounds then you have to affirm it) or else that all these are under no curse for Justification to remove. The Law of Nature was materially part of the Mosaical Law; but the form denominateth.

So much to Mr. *Blakes* Arguments, which are so little to the purpose, that if the weight of the cause, and the prejudice of some Readers did not call more earnestly for a Reply, then any apperance of strength in them, I had spared my self and the Reader this Labor. But that [*Christ as Christ is the object of that faith by which as a Condition We must be justified*] *and so that we are not justified only by believing in his blood, but also by believing in him entirely as Jesus Christ our Lord, and by becoming his Disciples, or true Christians,*] this is a truth, that deserveth more then my Pen to defend it; and that while God affordeth me time and strength, I shall never desert.

A

DISPVTATION

OF

IVSTIFICATION:

Whether any Works be any Conditions of it?

Conteining a neceſſary Defence of ancient Verity, againſt the unneceſſary Oppoſition of a very Learned, Reverend, and dearly Beloved Brother, in his Treatiſe of Imputation of Righteouſneſs, and his Lectures on John 17.

By *Richard Baxter.*

LONDON,

Printed by *Robert White*, for *Nevil Simmons*, Book-ſeller in *Kederminſter*, 1657.

Whether Works are a Condition of Justification? And so whether we are justified by Works as such a Condition?

THough we have said enough already on these Questions (which for dispatch I joyn together,) yet seeing there are some that must needs have more, or the same again; I shall yield so far to their Importunity, as to recite here briefly the state of the Controversie, and some of that evidence which is elsewhere more largely produced for the truth.

And First, We must explain what is meant by *Works*, and what is meant by *Justification*; what by a [*Condition*] and what by the Preposition *by* here, when we speak of Justification *by* works: And then we shall lay down the truth in several propositions, Negative and Affirmative.

It seems strange to me to hear men on either side to speak

againſt the Negative or Affirmative of the Queſtion, and reproach ſo bitterly thoſe that maintain them, without any diſtinction or explication; as if either the error lay in the terms, or the terms were ſo plain and univocal, that the Propoſitions are true only on one part, what ſenſe ſoever they be taken in. No doubt but he ſaith true, that ſaith that Works are the Condition of Juſtification: and he ſaith as true, that ſaith they are not, if they take the terms in ſuch different ſenſes as commonly Diſputers on theſe Queſtions do take them. And its paſt all doubt that [*a man is juſtified by faith without the works of the Law*; and that *it is not of Works, but of Grace*: and its as certain that [*a man is juſtified by works and not by faith only*; and that by *their Words men ſhall be juſtified, and by their Words they ſhall be condemned.*] Gods word were not true, if both theſe were not true.

We muſt therefore neceſſarily diſtinguiſh: And firſt of Works.

Firſt, Sometime the term, *Works* is taken for that (in general) which makes the *Reward to be not of Grace but of Debt*: Meritorious works: Or for ſuch as are conceited to be thus meritorious, though they be not. And thoſe are materially, either *Works of perfect obedience without ſin*, (ſuch as *Adam* had before his fall, and Chriſt had, and the good Angels have,) or elſe *Works of obedience to the Moſaical Law*, which ſuppoſed ſin, and were uſed in order to pardon and life, but miſtakingly by the blind Unbelievers, as ſuppoſing that the dignity of the Law did put ſuch a dignity on their obedience thereto, as that it would ſerve to life without the ſatisfaction and merit of Chriſt, or at leaſt muſt concur in Co-ordination therewith. Or elſe laſtly, they are Goſpel duties, thus conceited meritorious.

Secondly, But ſometime the word *Works* is taken for that which ſtandeth in a due ſubordination to grace: and that firſt, moſt generally, for *any moral virtuous Actions*, and ſo even faith it ſelf is comprehended and even the very Receptive or fiduciall act of faith: or leſs generally, for external acts of obedience, as diſtinct from internal habitual Grace: and ſo Repentance, Faith, Love, *&c.* are not Works: or for all acts external and internal, except faith it ſelf. And ſo Repentance,

Deſire

Desire after Christ, Love to him, denying our own Righteousnes, distrust in our selves, *&c.* are called Works. Or else for all Acts external and internal besides the Reception of Christs Righteousnes to Justification: And so the belief of the Gospel, the Acceptance of Christ as our Prophet and Lord by the Title of Redemption, with many other acts of faith in Christ, are called works: besides the disclaiming of our own Righteousnes, and the rest before mentioned.

Secondly, As for the word *Justification*, it is so variously taken by Divines, and in common use, that it would require more words then I shall spend on this whole Dispute, to name and open its several senses; and therefore (having elsewhere given a brief schem of them) I shall now only mention these few which are most pertinent to our purpose. First, Some take *Justification* for some Immanent Acts of God, and some for Transient. And of the former some take it for Gods eternal Decree to justifie, which neither Scripture calleth by this name, nor will Reason allow us to do it, but improperly. Sometime its taken for Gods Immanent present Approbation of a man, and Reputing him to be just, when he is first so constituted. And this some few call a Transient Act, because the Object is extrinsick: But most call it Immanent, because it makes no Alteration on that object. And some plead that this is an eternal act without beginning, because it is Gods essence which is eternal; and these denominate the Act from the substance or Agent; And other say, that it begins in time, because Gods Essence doth then begin to have that Respect to a sinner which makes it capable of such a denomination: And so these speak of the Act denominatively, formally, respectively: Both of them speak true but both speak not the same truth.

Sometime the word *Justification* is taken for a transient Act of God that maketh or conduceth to a change upon the extrinsick object. And so first, Its sometime taken by some Divines, for a Conditional Justification, which is but an act that hath a tendency to that change; and this is not actual Justification. Secondly, Sometime it is taken for actual Justification, and that is threefold. First, Constitutive: Secondly, Sentential: thirdly, executive. First, Constitutive Justification, is first either in the qualities

qualities of the soul, by inherent holyness; which is first perfect, such *Adam (once)* and the Angels, and Christ had; secondly, or Imperfect, such as the sanctified here have. Secondly, Or its in our Relations: when we are pardoned and receive our Right to Glory: This is an act of God in Christ by the free Gift of the Gospel, or Law of Grace: and it is first, The first putting a sinner into a state of Righteousness, out of a state of Guilt. Secondly, Or it is the continuing him in that state, and the renewing of particular pardon upon particular sins. Secondly, Sentential pardon or Justification, is, first, by that Manifestation which God makes before the Angels in heaven. Secondly, at the day of Judgement before all the world. Thirdly, Executive Justification, *viz.* the execution of the aforesaid sentence, (less properly called Justification, and more properly called pardon) consisteth in taking off the punishment inflicted, and forbearing the punishment deserved, and giving possession of the happiness adjudged us: so that it is partly in this life, *viz.* in giving the spirit, and outward mercies, and freeing us from judgements (And thus sanctification it self is a part of Justification) and partly in the life to come, in freeing us from Hell, and possessing us of Glory.

Thirdly, As for the word *Condition*, the Etymologists will tell us, that it first signifieth *Actionem condendi:* and then, *Passionem, qua quid conditur*, and then *qualitatem ipsam per quam condere aliquis, vel condi aliquid potest; & hinc est pro statu qui factus est rem condendo; & deinceps pro omni statu, quem persona vel res aut causa quoquo modo habet aut accipit.* But we have nothing to do with it in such large acceptions, in which all things in the world may be called Conditions. *Vid. Martin. in Nom.* They come nearer our use of the word, when they expound it by, *Moderatio, Circumscriptio, determinatio, limitatio.*

In *Naturals* the word *Condition* is oft used *pro ratione formali, per quam alicujus disciplinæ subjectum adæquatũ constitui solet.* As e. g. *Physicus considerat corpus, cum conditione mobilitatis, Geometer considerat quantitatem cum conditione continuitatis, Arithmeticus cum conditione disjunctionis; Medicus considerat humanũ corpus cum conditione, scil. quatenus ægrotare & sanari potest.* Sometime also any quality, or action, which is *sine qua non* to an effect

effect or event is in meer *Naturals* called a *Condition*; as the dryneſs of the wood, and the approximation of it to the fire, *&c.* are conditions of its burning: the non-impedition of a more powerful Agent, is a Condition of the efficacious action of every lower cauſe, *&c.*

Many other acceptions of the word in Phyſicks by *Zabarel*, *Claudius Alberius* and others; you may ſee in *Goclenii Lexic. Philoſoph. in nom. conditio.* But we are not in a Phyſical, but a moral diſcourſe, and therfore muſt be underſtood according to the ſubject matter. It is therfore a Civil or Legal Condition that we have to enquire *after*, and muſt fetch our deſcriptions from Lawyers, and not from Phyſicks, and therefore it is but deceitful equivocation in ſome Opponents, to fetch their oppoſition from Phyſical inſtances.

The Lawyers give us divers Definitions of Condition, but for the moſt part they come all to one in ſenſe. Some ſay, *conditio eſt Lex adpoſita hominum actionibus, eas ſuſpendens*, Prat. *Conditio* (ſay others) *eſt modus qui ſuſpendit actum, donec eo exiſtente confirmetur. Vult.* in *Inſtit. de hæred. inſtit.* § 3. n. 6. *Accurſus* ſaith, *Conditio eſt ſuſpenſio, cujus de futuro effectus vel confirmatio pendet:* Bart. *Conditio eſt futurus eventus, in quem diſpoſitio ſuſpenditur.* Cuiacius, *Conditio eſt Lex addita negotio, quæ donec præſtetur eventum ſuſpendit.* Theſe are of conditions *de futuro*: But thoſe that are *de præſenti vel de præterito*, ſuſpend not the obligation, unleſs as they are yet *futura quoad cognitionem*, though not *quoad eſſe*, and ſo the knowledge of a Right may be ſuſpended. They are commonly divided into *Caſuales*, *Poteſtativas*, *& mixtas.* The moral operation of Conditions as ſuch, is not in cauſing the effect when performed, but in ſuſpending the effect till performed. The reaſon of the appointing of them for ſuch ſuſpenſions is various: ſometime its becauſe the perſon Giving, promiſing, or otherwiſe conſtituting the condition, is uncertain of the event of the performance, and would not have the effect come to paſs without it. But thats not alwaies: ſometime though he might be ſure of the event of performance, yet if he that is to perform the Condition be uncertain, it may make way for this conſtitution. It is therefore a vain Plea of them that ſay, God appointeth no conditions of his Promiſes,

miſes, becauſe the event is not to him uncertain. Saith *Mat. Martin. in nom. Cond.* [*Definiri ſolet Diſpoſitionis ſuſpenſio ex eventu incerto futuro ei oppoſito. Sic ſane apud homines qui futura non norunt, ſed Deus ſub certis conditionibus etiam nobiſcum agit: at omnium eventuum ipſe gnarus, pro infinita ſua ſapientia qua prævidet quid occurſurum nobis, & quid nos amplexuri, vel declinaturi ſimus. Confer. Deut.* 28 29 30,31. *&* 32. *Capitobus.*] Commonly the reaſon of appointing Conditions is the deſireablneſs of the thing to be performed, conjoyned with ſome backwardneſs or poſſibility of backwardneſs in the perſon that is to perform it, and therefore he is drawn on by the promiſe of that which he is more willing to receive: But many other reaſons there may be.

The firſt cauſe of the Condition, is the Requirer, whether he be Teſtator, Donor, Stipulator, Legiſlator, *&c.* And ſo the Condition of the Law or Covenant of Grace, is firſt, *Gods* condition *as the Impoſer.* Secondly, And its the condition of each *Subject* as *obliged* to perform it. Thirdly, And the condition of each *profeſſing Chriſtian* as having *Promiſed* the performance. Fourthly, And the condition of *true Chriſtians* only as *actual Performers* of it.

The condition of the Goſpel hath ſeveral reſpects according to the various reſpects of the Law that doth impoſe it. Its the *Condition of a free Gift*; for the Goſpel is a free Gift of Chriſt and Life: It is the *Condition of a Promiſe*; becauſe much of the Goſpel benefits are future. It is the *Condition of a Teſtament*, becauſe Chriſt dying did leave this to the Church as his laſt Will, and it was confirmed by the death of the Teſtator. It is the *Condition of a premiant Law*, and Act of Grace and oblivion; becauſe God made it as Legiſlator and Rector of the world, in order to the conducting of his people to their happineſs: It is the condition *of a Minatory Law*, in that it is a duty commanded on pain of death and for the avoiding of that death.

Fourthly, The prepoſition [*by*] in our preſent queſtion, may ſignifie, either the uſe and Intereſt of any Medium in General; or elſe of a true *cauſe* conſtitutive or efficient. So much of the terms.

Propoſition

Proposition 1. Since *Adams* fall, it is impossible for man to be justified by a perfect sinless Obedience of his own, (except Christ only:) and consequently impossible for him to be justified by the Law considered in that form and tenor as it was given to *Adam*: for all men are sinners; and that Law will ustifie no sinner.

Proposition 2. By the works of the Mosaical Law, no man can be justified. And therefore the Jews seek Righteousness where it is not to be found, while they think that pardon of sin and acceptance with God are to be obtained by the bare works of that Law: while they overlook or reject Christ who is the end of that Law for righteousness to every Believer Specially now that Law is Abrogated or ceased, it were a double error to expect Justification by its works.

Proposition 3. Much less can they be justified by the foresaid Law, who in stead of fulfilling it, do but falsely imagine that they fulfil it.

Proposition 4. No man can be justified by works properly meritorious, because no man hath any such at all; nor may we once imagine that we have any such works as *Paul* speaks of (and the Jews thought they had) which make the reward to be not of Grace but of Debt, *Rom.* 4.4. much less that we are justified by such; even Gospel works and faith it self do not justifie on this account, and a conceit that they are thus meritorious would but turn them into condemning sins.

Proposition 5. No act of mans, no not faith it self can justifie as an act or work, nor as *This act in specie*: that is, the neareſt and formal reason of its justifying Interest *must* not be fetcht either from the General or special nature of the act it self: and therefore it is not faith as faith, that is, as it is an apprehension of Christ or recumbency on him, that Justifyeth: nor yet as an Instrument thus acting. The nature of the act is but its aptitude to its office ot justifying Interest, and not the formal cause of it.

Proposition 6. No work or act of man is any true proper cause of his justification, (as Justification is commonly taken in the Gospel:) neither Principal or Iustrumental. The highest Interest that they can have, is but to be a condition of our Justi-

tion, and so a *Dispositio moralis*, which therefore some call *causa dispositiva*, and some *causa sine qua non*, and its indeed but a *Nominall cause*, and truly no *cause* at all.

Proposition 7. Whatsoever works do stand in *opposition* to Christ, or *disjunct* from him, yea or that stand *not in a due subordination* to him, are so far from Justifying even as conditions, that they are sins which do deserve condemnation.

Proposition 8. Works, as taken for the Imperate Acts of Obedience external, distinct from the first Radical Graces, are not so much as conditions of our Justification as begun, or our being put into a Justified state.

Proposition 9. Repentance from dead works, denying our our selves, renouncing our own Righteousnes, *&c.* (much less external Obedience) are not the receptive condition of our Justification, as faith is, that is, *Their* nature is not to be an actual Acceptance of Christ, that is, they are not faith; and therefore are not designed on that account to be the Condition of our Justification.

Proposition 10. God doth not justifie us by Imputing our own faith to us in stead of perfect Obedience to the Law, as if it were sufficient, or esteemed by him sufficient to supply its place; For it is Christs Righteousnes that in point of value and merit doth supply its place: nor doth any work of ours justifie us by satisfying for our sins: for thats the work of Christ the Mediator: Our faith and love and obedience, which are for the receiving and improving of him and his Righteousnes and so stand in full subordination to him, are not to be made co-partners of his office or honor.

Affirm. *Proposition* first. We are justified by the merits of a perfect sinless Obedience of Christ (together with his sufferings) which he performed both to the Law of nature, the Law of *Moses*, and the Law which was proper to himself as Mediator, as the subject obliged.

Proposition 2. There is somewhat in the nature of faith it self *in specie*, which makes it fit to be *elected and appointed* by God to be the great *summary Condition* of the Gospel; that it be *Receptive* (an Acceptance of Christ) is the nature of the thing:

thing: but that it be a condition of our Justification, is from the will and constitution of the Donor and Justifier.

Proposition 3. There is also somewhat in the nature of Repentance, self-denyal, renouncing all other Saviours, and our own righteousnes, desiring Christ, loving Christ, intending God and Glory as our end, (procured by Christ,) confessing sin, *&c.* which make them apt to be *Dispositive Conditions*, and so to be comprized or implyed in faith the summary Receptive condition, as its necessary attendants at least.

Proposition 4. Accordingly God hath joyned these together in his Promise and constitution, making faith the *summary and receptive Condition*, and making the said acts of Repentance, self-denyal renouncing our own righteousnes, & disclaiming in heart Justification by the works of the Law, and the renouncing of all other Saviours, also the desiring and loving of Christ offered, and the willing of God as our God, and the renouncing of all other Gods, and so of the world, flesh and devil; at least in the resolution of the heart; I say making these the *dispositive Conditions*, which are ever implyed when faith only is expressed, some of them as subservient to faith, and perhaps some of them as real parts of faith it self. (Of which more anon.)

Proposition 5. The Gospel promiseth Justification to all that will *Believe*. (or are *Believers*.) To be a *Believer* and to be a *Disciple* of Christ, in Scripture sense is all one, and so is it to be a *Disciple* and to be a Christian: therefore the sense of the promise is, that we shall be justified, if we become true *Christians* or *Disciples* of Christ; and therefore justifying faith comprehendeth all that is essential to our Discipleship or Christianity as its constitutive causes.

Proposition 6. It is not therefore any one single Act of faith alone by which we are justified, but it is many Physical acts conjunctly which constitute that faith which the Gospel makes the condition of Life. Those therefore that call any one Act or two by the name of justifying faith, and all the rest by the name of works, and say that it is only the act of recumbency on Christ as Priest, or on Christ as dying for us, or only the act of apprehending or accepting his imputed Righteousnes, by

which we are justified, and that our Assent, or Acceptance of him as our Teacher and Lord, our desire of him, our love to him, our renouncing other Saviours and our own Righteousness, *&c.* are the works which *Paul* doth exclude from our Justification, and that it is Jewish to expect to be justified by these though but as Conditions of Justification; these persons do mistake *Paul*, and pervert the Doctrine of Faith and Justification, and their Doctrine tendeth to corrupt the very nature of Christianity it self. Though yet I doubt not but any of these acts conceited meritorious (or otherwise as before explained in the Negative) if men can believe contradictories, may be the matter of such works as *Paul* excludeth: And so may that one act also which they appropriate the name of justifying faith to.

Proposition 7. Sincere obedience to God in Christ is a condition of our continuance in a state of Justification, or of our not losing it. And our perseverance therein is a condition of our appearing in that state before the Lord, at our departure hence.

Proposition 8. Our Faith, Love, and Works of Love, or sincere Obedience, are conditions of our sentential Justification by Christ at the particular and general Judgement (which is the great Justification.) And so as they will prove our Interest in Christ our Righteousness, so will they materially themselves justifie us against the particular false Accusation of being finally impenitent, Unbelievers, not Loving, not obeying sincerely. For to deny a false accusation is sufficient to our Justification.

Proposition 9. As Glorification and Deliverance from Hell, is by some called Executive pardon or Justification; so the foresaid acts are conditions of that execution, which are conditions of Justification by the sentence of the Judge.

Proposition 10. As to a real inherent Justice, or Justification, in this life we have it in part (in our Sanctification and Obedience) and in the life to come we shall have it in perfection.

So much for the explicatory Propositions.

I come

I Come now to prove the ſum of the Affirmative Propoſitions together ſo far as they reſolve the Queſtion in hand, *viz.* that works or acts of man have ſuch an Intereſt in our Juſtification, and are ſo far conditions as is here aſſerted.

My firſt proof is from thoſe Texts of Scripture which expreſly ſpeak of Juſtification by ſuch acts or works.

If we are juſtified *By* our words and works, then are they no leſs then conditions of Juſtification. But we are juſtified *By* them. *Ergo.*&c.

The Conſequence of the Major is plain, firſt, In that the Prepoſition [*By*] doth ſignifie no leſs then the Intereſt of ſome means: but theſe Works can be no means, but either a condition or a cauſe, which is more: A cauſe, the perſons that now I deal with, will not affirm them to be: If they do, then they aſcribe much more to them then to be a condition. Secondly, The Intereſt of faith it ſelf is expreſſed by no higher terms then [*By*,] that is, ἐξ, or διὰ, or ἐν: and ſo is the Intereſt of theſe other acts.

The Minor is expreſs, 1. In *Mat.* 12. 36,37. [*For by thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt be condemned*]. (Ἐκ τῶν λόγων:) that is, at the day of Judgement, in the great Juſtification. 2. *Jam.* 2.24. *ye ſee then how that By Works* (ἐξ ἔργων) *a man is juſtified, and not by faith only* (καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον) This ſpeaks of Juſtification in this life.

When men argue againſt Juſtification by our *words* or *works*, I deſire 1. to underſtand whether it be the *words* or the *ſenſe* that they argue againſt. If the *words*, then it is either againſt the uſe of them *ſimply*, as being falſe or unmeet: or elſe againſt *unſeaſonable* uſe of them. For the former they have no ground; for you ſee it is the expreſs language of Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtle. And as to the later, I eaſily grant that no Scripture phraſe ſhould be unſeaſonably uſed. But if it be not the words but the ſenſe that they blame, why then do they harp ſo much on the words themſelves, and raiſe the moſt of the odium from thence? And what

what is the unwarrantable ſenſe? I know not of any lower ſenſe that they can put on theſe words, then what importeth the Intereſt of a condition: As for that of *Mat.* 12. they ſay little to it. And as to that of *James*, they interpret it differently among themſelves First, Some of them ſay that *James* ſpeaks of Juſtification before men, and others ſay he ſpeaks of Juſtification before God. The former are eaſily confuted (as they reſtrain the text to that alone) by the expreſs words of the Text. For, firſt, *ver.* 23. it expreſly ſpeaks of Righteouſneſs by divine Imputation, and of Gods accepting *Abraham* into friendſhip. Secondly, The text ſpeaks of that Juſtification which concurreth with Salvation, *ver.* 14. [*can faith ſave him?*] Thirdly, It ſpeaks of the Death of faith without works, as to *Profiting*, ver. 16. 17. which is different from *manifeſtation*. Fourthly, It inſtanceth in the ſecret act of *Rahab*, and ſuch an act of *Abraham*, as we read of no men that then juſtified him for, nay they were liker to condemn him. Fifthly, Men may juſtifie an Hypocrite as ſoon as the truly godly, and can but conjecture at the faith by the works. But the ſcope of the text ſhews that it is no ſuch frivolous juſtification that is here meant.

Secondly, They that ſay that it is juſtification before God that is here meant, (as no doubt it is) have yet divers interpretations of the word *Works*. Some ſay, that by *Works* is not meant [*Works themſelves*] indeed, but a *working* faith. To them I ſay, firſt, I deny it, and wait for better proof then is yet brought. Secondly, The text nameth [*works*] expreſly twelve times in a few verſes: which is not uſual in ſpeeches ſo tropicall as this is ſuppoſed to be. Thirdly, In many or moſt of the texts, that interpretation would make the words non-ſenſe, as the peruſall will declare. Fourthly, If the word [*works*] did emphatically ſignifie the [*working nature*] of faith, or faith not *qua fides*, but *qua operans*, it will be all one as to the matter in queſtion, and yield what I deſire.

Others ſay that by *works* is indeed meant the *works themſelves* properly; but then they ſay that the text ſpeaks not of the Juſtification of the perſon by them, but of faith by them; for faith, ſay they, alone doth juſtifie the perſon, and works only juſtifie faith. Anſwer, But firſt, this contradicteth the expreſs text: for

verſe

Simon Jones his hand 1733

verse 14. It is the Salvation of the person that is denyed; and *ver.* 21. It it the justification of *Abraham* himself that is there mentioned; and *ver.* 24. it is the *man* that is said to be *justified by Works and not by faith only*; and *verse* 25. it is *Rahab* her self that is said to be *justified by works*. Secondly, The answer contradicteth themselves, or granteth what I desire: for if works justifie the faith, they must needs justifie the person *in tantum*, against any accusation of gross Infidelity and Hypocrisie. Sometime the person is justified when his Action cannot be justified (as in case of satisfaction and pardon:) but to justifie the action it self, is the higheſt sort of justifying the person.

So that all other Interpretations being either overthrown, or resolved into that which we maintain, I need to say to more for the defending of it.

My next proof is from those texts that say, we shall be *Judged according to our works, and rewarded according to our Labour*, &c. 2 *Cor.* 5.9, 10. 1 *Cor.* 3.8. 1 *Pet.* 1. 16, 17. *Matthew* 16. 27. *&c.*

If men shall be justified *according* to their works, then those works are no lower then a condition of that justification: But the Antecedent is true, as I prove thus. If men shall be judged according to their works, therefore they shall be *justified* according to their works: The reason of the Consequence is evident; because *judging* is the *Genus*, which comprehendeth Justification and condemnation as its *species*. The reason also of the consequence of the former Argument is apparent: because the term [*of judging according to works*] doth in the common use of men signifie ordinarily that which they call the *Meritum causæ*, but never any thing lower then a bare condition: nor can any lower tolerable judiciary sense be put upon them, as might easily be shewed if it were worth the standing on.

My next proof is from those texts that expresly promise the pardon of sin on condition of Repentance, Confession, *&c.* If Repentance, and other acts are made by the Gospel, conditions of pardon, (and our first general Pardon) then are they made conditions of our first admission into a state of Justification. But the Antecedent is plain, in *Act.* 2. 38. *Mar.* 14.

Luke 13. 35. *Isa.* 55.67. and 1.16, 17,18. *Ezek.* 33.11, 16. and 18. 28,29,30,31,32. *Prov.* 28.13. *Act.* 3.19. with many more. The Consequence is plain, in that *Pardon* is by very many made the whole of our Justification; and by others confessed a chief part; and by all its confessed to be made ours on the same terms as is Justification it self.

My fourth Proof is from those texts which make these kind of Acts to have the place of a condition in order to *salvation*; if they are conditions of salvation, then are they no less then conditions of our final Justification: But the Antecedent is ordinarily acknowledged by the Opponents, and its proved, 1 *Tim.* 4.8. *Heb.* 5.9. 1 *Tim.* 6.18,19. *Luk.* 11.28. and 13.24 1 *Cor.* 9.24,25,26,27. *Rev.* 22.14. *John* 12.26. *Rom.* 8.13. *Mat.* 5.20. *Mat.* 19.29. *Mat.* 6.1,2,4,6. and 5.12,46. and 10.41,42. 2 *Thess.* 1.5,6. *Col.* 3.23,24. *Heb.* 6.10. 2. *Tim.* 4.7,8. *Gal.* 6.4,5,6,7,8,9,10. 2 *Cor.* 9.6,9. *John* 5.22, 27, 28, 29, *&c.* The Consequence is proved good, first, In that final Justification and Glorification have the same conditions; as is plain, both in many Scriptures (*mentioned*) and in the nature of the thing: for that Justification is the adjudging us to that Glory; and therefore so far as any thing is the cause or condition of the Glory it self, it must be the reason of the sentence which *adjudgeth* it to us. Secondly, And salvation is as free as Justification, and no more deserved by man: and therefore the Apostle equally excludeth works from both, *Eph.* 2.5,8,9. *By Grace ye are saved, through faith, and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast.*] so *Tit.* 3.5,6,7. more fully. Now if *Salvation by grace through faith without works*, exclude not sincere obedience from being a Condition of *Salvation*, then *Justification by grace through faith without works*, doth not (in Scripture sence) exclude sincere obedience from being the condition of our *final Justification*, nor Repentance from being the condition of our *justification as begun*: (for there is *eadem ratio*, and the Text makes the one as free without works, as the other) But the Antecedent is plain in the Scriptures, *Ergo*, &c.

My fifth Proof is from those texts that in terms seem to assign

ſign a *cauſality* to ſuch obediential acts, which can be interpreted of no leſs then a *conditionality*; ſuch are *Luke* 19.17. *Mat.*25. 21,23,34,35,40,46. *Gen.* 22. 16,17,18. 2 *Chron.* 34.26,27. *Pſalm* 91. 9,14. *Mark* 7.29. 1 *John* 3. 22,23. *John* 16.27. *Rev.* 3.10. and 3.4. and 7.14,15. *&c.* And though ſome of theſe texts ſpeak not of Divine acceptance to life; yet firſt, ſome do; ſecondly, and the reſt ſpeak of no mercy but what is as freely given as *Juſtification*. A mans own works are excluded other Means and parts of ſalvation, as well as that.

I run over theſe briefly and generally, both becauſe I expect that the bare texts without my Comments, ſhould work upon the Conſiderate, and becauſe I have been ſo much upon it formerly in other writings (as Confeſs. §. 3. *p.* 56. *cap.* 3. *&* *cap* 5. §. 2. *pag.* 117,118. *&* *alibi paſſim*) as that I apprehend in this work more tedioufneſs than neceſſity.

But the chief thing that I further here intend, is to anſwer ſome Objections, that by a Reverend Brother in his ſecond part of his Treatiſe of Juſtification are brought againſt me.

But before I come to his Arguments, its neceſſary that I a little animadvert on his Deſcription of Juſtification, that we may firſt agree upon the ſenſe of our terms, or at leaſt, know how to underſtand one another.

Treat. *Of Juſtification. p.* 126. [*Juſtification is a gratious and juſt Act of God, whereby through Chriſt our Mediator and Surety, a ſinner, but repenting and believing, is pronounced juſt, and hereby put into a ſtate of Reconciliation and favour with God, to the praiſe of Gods glorious attributes, and to the Believers eternal ſalvation. I ſhall not examine this Deſcription by accurate Logical Rules*, &c.

Anſw. Firſt. Doubtleſs an accurate, rather then popular definition would as ſoon be expected from you, as from moſt; and here as anywhere in a Treatiſe purpoſely on the Subject. Secondly, Pronunciation doth not go before Conſtitution, nor put us into a ſtate of Reconciliation and favour, but find us in it, you ſay your ſelf. *pag.* 120. *To juſtifie, is to conſtitute and to declare or pronounce righteous*, And in your firſt Treatiſe of Juſtification. *pag.* 7. *Indeed the Apoſtle*, Rom. 5. faith, many

are made righteous by the second *Adam*; which if not meant of inherent holineſs doth imply that the righteouſneſs we have by Chriſt, is not meerly declarative, but alſo conſtitutive; and indeed, one is in order before the other; for a man muſt be righteous, before he can be pronounced or declared ſo to be.]

Treat. *p. The Application of (Juſtification) is attributed to the Holy Ghoſt.*

Anſw. I know not of any ſuch, except firſt, where Juſtification is taken for Sanctification. Secondly, or as the Holy Ghoſt is made the Author of the Promiſe, though I doubt not but he is the Author of faith alſo.

Treat. 16. *The* Socinians *ſay Chriſt juſtifieth only Inſtrumentally, not principally; even ſo faith is ſaid to ſave: but this cannot be, becauſe Chriſt is God as well at Man, and therefore cannot be inſtrumental, but principal.*

Anſw. As they err on one hand, that ſay Chriſt juſtifieth *only* Inſtrumentally (which flows from their blaſphemous denyall of his God-head) ſo its an error on the other hand, to ſay that Chriſt cannot be Inſtrumental, but principal; I prove the contrary; firſt, If Chriſt may be an Officer appointed by the Father to the Redemption, and ruling of mankind, then may he be an Inſtrument. But, *&c.* Ergo, *&c.*

Secondly, If Chriſt may be a means, he may be an Inſtrument; but he may be a means, for he is called by himſelf the way to the Father: and a way is a means.

Thirdly, He is called the Fathers ſervant: therefore he may be an Inſtrument.

Fourthly, He is ſaid to come to do his Fathers will, therefore he is his Inſtrument.

Fifthly, All *Power* is ſaid to be given him, even the Power of judging, *John* 5. 22. and *Matthew* 28. 18, 19. therefore he is the Fathers Inſtrument in judging.

And your reaſon is invalid, (*viz.* becauſe Chriſt is God) for he is Man as well as God, and ſo may be Inſtrumental.

Treat.

Treat. *p.* 129, 130. *It sounds as intolerable Doctrine in my ears, that Christ our Mediator did only expiate by his death sins against the Law and Covenant of works, but that those that are against the Covenant of Grace,* &c.

Answ. A sin is against the Law of Grace or Gospel, first, because it is against some object revealed in the Gospel, which the sin is against, (as Christ) Thus sin was expiated by Christ: 2ly. As it is against a Precept of the Gospel and thus it is expiated by Christ: 3ly. As it is a breach of a mans own Promise or Covenant made to Christ upon the Gospel invitation. And thus it is expiated by Christ. 4ly. Or as it hath respect to the Gospel commination, so as to make a man the object of the actuall curse of this New Covenant, or the person to whom its proper penalty is become actually due; as every sin made the penalty of the first Law actually due to us. This is it that I have said, that Christ doth not expiate, and none but this. Some Divines say, the Gospel hath no proper curse or commination & penalty. I am past doubt that it hath, even non-liberation, a privation of all the salvation offered them, and the Remedilesness of their state, *&c.* and I have oft opened this, and proved that only final Impenitency and Infidelity, or the finall non-performance of the conditions of life, are thus peremptorily threatned, and make a man the Subject of the proper actual curse of this Law of Grace. And if after all explications, you will still carry it in confusion, or intimate that men hold intolerable Doctrine, omitting their explications, and by generals making that theirs which they disclaim: our next reply shall be patience; or if you think indeed, either that the Law of Grace doth oblige any under the penalty of remedilesse non-liberation, besides the finally Impenitent and Unbelievers, or that Christ dyed to expiate any mans predominant final Impenitency or Unbelief, I will not trouble you with any other confutation; then a denyal of it.

Treat. *p. ibid. Repentance is not an ingredient to our Justification as faith is; Repentance qualifieth the Subject, but faith immediatly receiveth it.*

Answer. The Word *Ingredient* is more ambiguous then to be worthy the labour of discussing : But your assigned difference I ever did allow. And yet must we voluminously differ, when I have told you that I allow it ? But then I add, that this difference is in the nature of the acts, and in their aptitude to their office. But in the general nature of *being Conditions of pardon*, which is the neareſt reason of their interest, they agree, though upon several reasons they are made conditions.

Treat. [*We are not justified by the Habit of faith ; but by the Act.*]

Answer. I said so too in my Aphorisms. But the reasons of a learned man (Dr. *Wallis* in his friendly animadversions) have perswaded me that it is unsound.

Treat. *p.* 129. *It is asserted, that Justification called* in Titulo, *or virtual, is nothing but the Grant of it in the Gospel : But I see not how that can be called our Justification.*

Answ. First, That which is asserted, is, first, That the Gospel is the Instrument justifying. Secondly, That the moral act of the Gospel-Grant (and Gods Will by it) is Justification *in sensu activo.* Thirdly, That the Relation resulting there-from, is our passive Justification.

Secondly, Can you see how a Princes pardon under his hand-writing can be the Instrument of a Traitors pardon ; and how the moral or civil Action of that Instrument, and of the Prince by it, can be active pardon ; and how the Relation effected by it can be passive pardon ? If you can see it there, you may see it here : And if yon cannot, many a one can.

Treat. *It is the sign or Instrument declaring it : not justification it self.*

An. Who ever said, and where, that passive Justification (yea or active)

active) is the Gospel it self, or the sign? The Letter is the sign; The actual signification of Gods will thereby is the justifying act. The Relation thence resulting on us, is our passive Justification. These have been oft recited.

Treat. *As the grant or promise of our Sanctification is not our Sanctification.*

Answ. Good reason: The difference is not to you unknown: Sanctification (passive) being a Physical effect, must have a Physical cause, and therefore a bare moral cause cannot produce it. But pardon or justification being but a Relative effect, may be produced *per nudam resultantiam à fundamento.* 2. But suppose God had made a promise of Sanctification on condition of faith; would not the *Right* to Sanctification have resulted immediately from this promise, the condition being performed? And that *Right* hath the same Relative nature, as constitutive Justification, and pardon it self hath.

Treat. *And as on the contrary our condemnation while We abide in sin, or Gods anger against the sinner, is not the threatning promulged, but that which comes from God himself.*

Answ. 1. Our Condemnation *per sententiam Judicis*, is not the thing in question, nor yet the explication of it; but our constitutive condemnation. And that it is not indeed the Letter of the Law, (whoever said so) but *activè*, it is the action of the Law, *& passivè sumpta*, it is the Relative effect of the Law.

2. From your own Argument reverst, I unresistibly make good my Cause against you. Condemnation active is the Laws act, and condemnation Passive is the Laws immediate effect: therefore Justification is alike produced by the Promise or Gift in the Gospel. The Antecedent is proved, *Iohn* 3. 18. *he that believeth on him, is not condemned,* (for the Obligation is dissolved) *but he that believeth not, is condemned already.*] Which must be by some Law, it being before Judgement and Execution, 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. The Law in its delivery is called [the ministration.

tion of condemnation] and that of the Gospel [the ministration of righteousnéss] *Iam.* 2. 9. men are said to be [*convinced of the Law as transgressors.*] Though *Paul* confute the false conceits of Justification by the Law, yet he took them for no unfit phrases, to speak of [*the Law working wrath*] *Rom.* 4. 15. [*The curse of the Law*] *Gal.* 3. 13. And saith, *Whatsoever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law*] *Rom.* 3. 19. When the *Law comes, sin reviveth, and we die, Rom.* 7. 8, 9. therefore we are said to be [*delivered from the Law,*] *Rom.* 8. 2. *& Gal.* 3. 13. *Rom.* 7. 6. And *Gal.* 3. 21. *If there had been a Law given which could have given life, righteousness should have been by the Law.* Hence then is mention of being *Justified by the Law, Gal.* 5. 4. and mens being *debtors to the Law, Gal.* 5. 3. And somewhat this way is implyed by *Nicodemus, John* 7. 51. *doth our Law judge any man before, &c.*] In a word, what more common among Divines, then to say, [*the Law curseth or condemneth sinners*] And then it is not abhorrent from the nature of a Law of Grace, an act of Oblivion, to absolve and justifie sinners.

Treat. *Neither then could we say, that we are justified by Christ given to us, but by the proposition laid down in the Scripture, whereas all say that the* objectum quod *of our faith is* ens incomplexum, *not the promise of Christ, but Christ himself promised.*

Answ. Its no impossible thing to be justified both by Christ, and by the Promise. There is no ground to suppose co-ordinates to be contraries. Why may not Christ given us, justifie us as the meritorious cause, and a principal efficient; and his Gospel-grant, as his Instrument? And accordingly each of them may be the object of faith. The principal object is an *ens incomplexum*, Christ himself: but a subordinat Object is both the Doctrine Revealing what he is and hath done, and the promise which offereth him to us, and telleth us what he will do. If a Princes Son redeem a woman from Captivity, or the Gallows, and cause an Instrument under his own hand (and the Kings) to be sent to her, assuring her of pardon, and liberty,

and

and honours with himself, if she will take him for her husband, and trust him for the accomplishment? Is it not possible for this woman to be pardoned and delivered by the King by the Princes ransom, by the Prince espoused, and by her marriage with him, and by the Instrument of pardon or conveyance You may be enriched by a Deed of Gift, and yet it may be an *ens incomplexum* that is bestowed on you by that Deed, and enricheth you too. Your Money and your Lease, both may give you title to your house. The promise is Gods Deed of Gift, bestowing on us Christ and pardon, or Justification with him.

Treat. *Besides*, Abraham *was Justified, and he is made the pattern of all that shall be Justified: Yet there was no Scripture-grant, or deed of gift in writing, declaring this: God then communicating himself to Belivers in an immediate manner.*

Answ. Was there no Gospel-grant then extant? no deed of Gift of Christ and his Righteousness to all that should believe? Nothing to assure men of Justification by faith, but immediate communications to Believers? If so, then either there was no Church, and no salvation: or a Church and salvation without faith in Christ: and either faith in the Messiah to come for pardon and life, was a duty, or no duty: If no duty, then —— If a duty, then there was a Law enjoyning it, and that Law must needs contain or be conjunct with a revelation of Christ, and pardon and life to be had by him. I suppose that whatever was the standing way of Life and Justification then to the Church, had a standing precept and promise to engage to the duty and secure the benefit. I know not of duty without Precept, nor of faith without a word to be believed. But this word was not written! True! but what of that? Was it ever the less a Law or Promise, the Object of Faith, or Instrument of Justification? The promise of the seed might be conveighed by Tradition, and doubtless was so. Or if there had been no general conditional grant or offer of pardon through Christ in those times, but only particular communications to some men, yet would those have been nevertheless instrumental.

Treat. *Therefore to call this Grant or Conditional Promise in the Scripture,* Whosoever shall believe shall be justified, *a transient act of God, is very unproper, unless in such a sense, as We say, such a mans writing is his hand, and that is wholly impertinent to our purpose.*

Answ. There are two distinct acts of God here that I call Transient. The first is the Enacting of this Law, or giving this promise. If this were not Gods act, then it is not his Law or promise. If it be his act, it is either Transient, or Immanent. I have not been accustomed to believe that Legislation, Promising, *&c.* are no acts, or are Immanent acts. The second is the continued Moral Action of the Word, which is also Gods Action by that Word as his Instrument: As it is the Action of a written Pardon to Acquit, and of a Lease to give Title, *&c.* And so the Law is said to absolve, condemn, command, *&c.* *What it saith, it saith to them that are under the Law:* And to say, is to Act. Though physically this is no other Action, then a sign performeth in signifying, or a *fundamentum* in producing the Relation, which is called the neareſt efficient of that Relation. Now either you think that to *oblige* (the most essential act of Laws) to *absolve, condemn,* &c. are Gods acts by his Word, or not. If not, the mistake is such as I dare not confute, for fear least by opening the greatness of it, I offend you. If yea; then either it is Gods Immanent act, or his Transient. The former I never to this day heard or read any man affirm it to be. That which is done by an Instrument, is no Immanent act in God: To oblige to duty, to give right to Impunity and Salvation, *&c.* are done by Instruments, *viz.* the Word of God, as it is the signifier of his will: therefore they are not Immanent Acts. Moreover, that which is begun in time, and is not from Eternity, is no Immanent Act. But such are the fore-mentioned: because the word which is the Instrument, was indited in time. Lastly, that which maketh a change on the extrinsick object is no Immanent act, but such are these Moral acts of the Word: for they change our Relations, and give us a Right which we had not before, *&c.* therefore they are certainly transient

ſient acts. A thing that I once thought I ſhould never by man have been put to prove.

Treat. pag. 130. *Its true at the day of Judgement there will be a ſolemn and more compleat Juſtifying of us, as I have elſwhere ſhewed.*

Anſw. You have very well ſhewed it: and I take gratefully that Lecture, and this Conceſsion.

Treat. pag. 131. *Indeed we cannot then be ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, &c. Hence this kind of Juſtification will ceaſe in heaven (as implying imperfection.)*

Anſw. And I deſire you to obſerve, that if it be no diſhonour to Chriſt, that we be there (through his grace) everlaſtingly juſtified without his Imputed righteouſneſs, or pardon, or faith *pro futuro*, it cannot be any diſhonour to him here, that we ſhould repent, and believe, and be ſanctified, nor that thoſe ſhould be conditions of further mercy, and ſufficient of themſelves to juſtifie us againſt any falſe charge that we are Impenitent, unſanctified Infidels. If a perfect cure diſgrace not our Phyſitian then ſure an imperfect cure and the acknowledgement of it, is no diſhonour to our Phyſitian now.

Treat. pag. 137. *Thus all thoſe Arguments, If we be juſtified by faith, then by our own work, and that this is to give too much to faith, yea more then ſome ſay they do to works, which they hold a condition of our Juſtification; All theſe and the like Objections vaniſh; becauſe we are not juſtified by faith, as Juſtification is conſidered actively, but paſſively.*

Anſw. 1. I yet think that I have ſaid enough in my private Papers to you, to confute the conceit of faith's being Paſſive. 2. If I had not, yet you yield me what I deſire: if faith act not, but ſuffer, to our Juſtification, then is it no efficient Inſtrumental cauſe. For all true efficiency is by Action. And ſo you keep but a Metaphorical Inſtrument. But of this more hereafter.

Treat. pag. 141. *We cannot call Remiſſion of ſin a ſtate, as we call Juſtification.*

Anſw. I do not believe you: and I can bring many Scriptures againſt you. But to your ſelf its enough to ask, How can you conſtantly make Remiſſion an Eſſential part of Juſtification, and yet ſay, that we cannot call it a ſtate, as we do Juſtification. In your firſt Treat. of Juſt. *Lect.* 17. *pag.* 145. you ſay, *Prop.* 4. Remiſſion is not to be conſidered meerly as removing of evil, but alſo as beſtowing good. It is not only *ablativa mali*, but *collativa boni*, a plentiful vouchſafing of many gracious favours to us, ſuch as a Son-ſhip, and a Right to eternal life, as alſo peace with God, and communion with him.] And why may we not ſay, [A *ſtate* of Sonſhip or ſalvation] as well as of Juſtification?

Treat. ib. *There is a Juſtification of the cauſe, and of the perſon, alwaies to be diſtinguiſhed.*

Anſw. There is no Juſtification of his cauſe, which doth not ſo far juſtifie the perſon: Nor any ſentential Juſtification of the perſon, but by juſtifying his cauſe. Though his actions may not be juſtifiable; yet when the cauſe to be tryed is, Whether ſinful actions be pardoned by Chriſt, that cauſe muſt be juſtified, if that man be juſtified. Even as Accuſations are not charged upon the perſon, without ſome cauſe real or pretended.

Treat. pag. 152. *Not only* Bucer *Who is known to place Juſtification both in Imputed righteouſneſs and Inherent, thereby endeavouring a Reconciliation with the Papiſts* —— *But* Calvin *li.* 3. *cap.* 17. *ſect.* 8. —— *To this purpoſe alſo* Zanchy ——.

Anſw. Why then might not I have had as fair meaſure as *Lud. de Dieu, Bucer, Calvin, Zanchy*? eſpecially when I go not ſo far. And yet I take my ſelf beholden to *Guil. Rivet*, for helping me to ſome ſcraps of *Phil. Codurcus*, who drives at this mark,

mark, as you say *Bucer* doth, though I cannot yet get the Book it self.

Treat. pag. 158. *O this is excellent, when a man is amazed and in an holy manner confounded at his holiness, as well as at his offences.*

Answ. So you before say, they must be ashamed of their Righteousness as well as their sins. I do not well understand these distinctions. Nothing in all the world confoundeth me so much as the imperfection of my Holiness: But I dare not think that imperfection to be no sin, lest I must think the perfection to be no duty, and so come to works of supererrogation and Evangelical Counsels. And Holiness considered in it self, and not as sinful and imperfect, is amiable in my eyes, and I know not how to be ashamed of it, without being ashamed of God that is its object and exemplar, and heaven that is the state of its perfection.

Treat. ib. *Set some few, even a remnant aside, comparatively, the whole Christian world both Doctors and people, learned and unlearned, fasten on a Justification by works.* ———

Answ. I hope not so many as you fear, or affirm. First, all the Doctors and people of your judgement do not: And if you thought those so exceeding few among Christians, you would not take me for so singular as you do. 2. None of the truly sanctified are such as you here affirm. 3. The multitude of groundless presumers of Free Grace are not such. And truly though I doubt Justiciaries are too common, I do not think that such Presumptuous ones are so small a Remnant. 4. The Libertines and Antinomians, and many other Sects of their mind, are none of this great number. 5. I will yet hope for all this, that you cannot prove it of the Doctors and people of half the Christian world. Their hearts God knows. And I will not yet believe that in their Doctrine about Justification by works, the Greek churches, the Armenians, Jacobites, Copti's, Abasines, &c. do fasten on such dangerous sands, or differ so much from you.

you. 6. I heard as eminent Divines as moſt I know (ſome yet living) in a publick meeting ſay, that Biſhop *Uſher* and Mr. *Gataker* affirmed, that the Papiſts did not fundamentally differ from us in the Doctrine of Juſtification.

Treat. pag. 167. *By all theſe ſubtile Diſtinctions, men would be thought*——

Anſw. Your ſcope in that page ſeems to be againſt any diſtinguiſhing whatſoever about works, in this propoſition, *We are juſtified by faith, and not by works*, If ſo, that we muſt not run to any diſtinction, but ſay that in every motion or ſenſe, Works are excluded, and do juſtifie in none, then I profeſs it is paſt my uttmoſt skill to juſtifie you for accuſing *Althamer* as you do, for ſaying, *Mentiris Jacobe in caput tuum:* Yea if he had upon the reading of *Mat.* 12. 36. riſen higher, and ſaid, *Mentiris Chriſte in caput tuum.* For ſure he that ſaith, [*By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified*] Or *by works* a man *is juſtified, and not by faith only*] can no way poſſibly be excuſed from that crime, if no diſtinction may verifie his words; but they muſt then be taken as abſolutely falſe: which I will not be perſwaded of.

Treat. pag. 219. Serm. 23. Obſerv. *That even the moſt holy and regenerate man is not Juſtified by the works of grace which he doth. This truth is the more diligently to be aſſerted, by how much the error that confronts it is more ſpecious and refined, and maintained by ſuch abettors, whoſe repute is not ſo eaſily caſt off as the former We ſpake of.*

Now you come purpoſely, I perceive to deal with me. I confeſs the repute of Abettors doth much to bear up opinions through the world, even with them that ſpeak moſt againſt implicit faith. But you need not deſpair of caſting off the repute of them you mention. Mr. *Robertſon* and Mr. *Crandon* can teach any man that will learn that leſſon.

Treat. ib. *The Queſtion is not, Whether We are Juſtified by Works, though flowing from grace, as meritorious or efficient of Juſtification.*

ſtification. This the Opinioniſts we have to deal with, do reject with indignation. To make Works either meritorious or efficient cauſes of our Juſtification before God, they grant it directly to oppoſe the Scriptures; yea they ſeem to be offended with the Orthodox, as giving too much to faith, becauſe it is made an inſtrument of our Juſtification: therefore they are to be acquitted at leaſt from groſs Popery.

Anſw. This is one paſſage which I underſtand by your Preface to you Sermons on *John* 17. you lookt for thanks for: and I do freely thank you for it: for the world is ſuch now, as that I muſt take my ſelf beholden to any man that doth injure me with moderation and modeſty. But you might have done that juſtice to us Opinioniſts, as to have put [*any cauſes at all*] inſtead of [*efficient cauſes*] when we had ſo often told you (the Orthodox) that we diſclaimed all true cauſality; and then your Reader would have been ready to hope that we are free alſo from the finer Popery as well as the groſs. But ſince I have heard of late times, what it is that goes under the name of Antichriſtianity and Popery, even with many that are able to call themſelves Orthodox, and others that diſſent from them, worſe then Opinioniſts; I confeſs I begin to have charitable thoughts of a man that is but freed from the charge of groſs Popery: and if thoſe tongues ſhould free him alſo from the imputation of all the finer Popery, I ſhould begin to ſuſpect that ſomewhat is amiſs.

Treat. ib. 2. *Although to maintain faith and Obedience to be the conditions, and a* cauſa ſine qua non *of our Juſtification, be the profeſſed and avowed Doctrine of the Socinians, yet ſome of late have aſſerted the ſame Doctrine, that yet abhor Socinianiſm*——.

Anſw. For this alſo I give you the thanks which you expected, on the foreſaid grounds. But if we aſſert the ſame Doctrine with the Socinians, either it is the ſame *falſe* Doctrine, or the ſame *ſound* Doctrine. If the later, you might as well have ſaid, the Socinians aſſert that there is a God, and ſo do we: But to what

what purpose? If the former; then either it is false *quoad terminos*, or *quoad sensum*. The former cannot be said without absurdity: the words can have no other falsness, but an unfitness, distinct from the sense: And if the terms be any part of *Socinianism*, then Christ and *James* were guilty of *Socinianism*; *quod absit*. If it be the sense; First, I crave no other favour of the impartial Reader, before he judge, then to read the *Socinians* explication of themselves, and to read my explication here, and in my confession. Secondly, And if he will also peruse the Allegations in the end of that confession, let him judge whether the Orthodox be not guilty of *Socinianism*. Or if he be tempted to believe Dr. *Owens* intimations, as if I had dealt injuriously with the Authors there alleadged, I only desire him to turn to the places cited, and peruse them in the Authors, and freely censure me.

Treat. 220. *Neither is the question about the necessity of holiness,* &c. ——— *Only the question is upon what account these are required in justified persons; whether in some* causality, *or concurrence as faith is, only not with such a degree of excellency? Whether good works be required as well as faith, so that we may say, justifying Repentance, justifying Law, (Love, it should be) as well as justifying faith? This is positively and vehemently affirmed by some: but certainly those Arguments and Reasons they bring are too weak to gainsay the Torrent of the Orthodox Divines.*

Answ. Upon the reading of this, I complained of hard measure in the Preface to my confession: to which you reply somewhat in your Preface to Sermons on *John* 17. I shall recite the reasons of my complaint. First, I did both at large in private writings to your self, and publiquely to the world, profess that I took neither faith nor works for any causes at all of our Justification; was it just then to make this the state of the Question, and say I positively and vehemently affirmed it? (for you deny not that it is me that you mean, and I know it by passages here agreeable to your private letters) Secondly, I never once imagined the difference between faith and holy obedience

dience or ſanctification, to lie (in order to Juſtification) in the degree of excellency. I never to my remembrance ſo thought, or wrote, or ſpoke. But the difference I laid here, firſt, That (as to actual obedience, yea and Repentance) faith hath a peculiar aptitude to this office, as being a Receptive act, and fited to the object, as that object is fitted to our neceſsity. Secondly, That (as to aſſent, deſire of Chriſt, love to Chriſt offered, accepting him as Teacher, and Lord) they are eſſential acts of faith, and ſo differ not at all, as they are by many ſuppoſed to do. Nay, I rather expected that ſome ſhould have charged me with preferring Holineſs before faith in excellency, while I made faith but the ſeed, and holyneſs as the fruit; faith to be but the covenanting, and Obedience the performance of what we conſented to; and in a word, while I made perfect holineſs the end of faith, becauſe the end is better then the means: And I was glad when I found you ſaying the like, *Vindic. Legis, Lect.* 4. *pag.* 45. [13. *Holineſs and Godlineſs inherent, is the end of Faith and Juſtification.*] But little did I think to have been charged, and that by you, for making the difference to lie in faiths higher degree of excellency, and only in that. Thirdly, I never owned the phraſe of [*juſtifying Repentance, juſtifying Love*] nor ever ſaid that we may as well uſe theſe as [*juſtifying faith*] And when none of theſe things were ever ſaid or written by me, ought you to have left on record to Generations, that [*this is poſitively and vehemently affirmed.*] On the conſideration of this dealing, I muſt ſay again, O what is man, and what a ſad caſe were we in, if the beſt of men were our Judges! when they will not ſtick deliberately to publiſh to the preſent and future Ages, that we *poſitively and vehemently* affirm thoſe things, which we never thought nor wrote, but have by Letters and in printed books both poſitively and vehemently, & very frequently profeſſed the contrary. Is here any room for further diſputing? yea, when I have told you of this dealing, you own it ſtill, and defend it in your Preface to your Sermons on *John* 17. I ſhall therefore before I proceed, examine that Defence.

Preface. *pag.* 3. [Now when I had endeavoured to ſtate the Queſtion in a moſt candid and fair way between thoſe

that deny a *Condition sine qua non* of our Justification, and those who affirm. A Reverend and Learned Brother, judging himself concerned in this opinion likewise, doth complain of the want of Candor and truth in my stating of the Question, when I rather expected thanks for my Ingenuity: —— Now let any judicious Reader, that is acquainted with controversie, decide, wherein any Candor or truth may be desired here. For I say [*causality*] which is a general word, not efficiency or merit; Again, I say, some causality, *Causalitas quædam*, which is *terminus diminuens*: yea I added the word *Concurrence*, which might satisfie any how low I brought the Question.

Answer. Will you call to any *judicious Reader*, to tell you that which I particularly expreſt to you? Again, Then let the judicious Reader judge whether you should have said to the world, any of the forementioned particulars; First, That I give any Causality to works as to Justification. Secondly, Or that I difference them only in degree of excellency. Thirdly, Or that I affirm, that we may say, justifying Repentance, justifying Love, as well as justifying faith. Fourthly, And this is affirmed positively, and vehemently: and all this when I had positively and vehemently denyed them. Fifthly, Yea, and that *only* this is the question between us.

And what do your defences do to justifie such dealing? [you said only *Causality* in general, and not *Efficiency* or *Merit*] And did not I openly and privately to you deny *Causality* in general, and not only *Merit* or *Efficiency*? and is that positive or vehement affirming it? Secondly, [you said, *Causalitas quædam*, which is *terminus diminuens*.] If *quoad esse causalitatis* it be *terminus diminuens*, then the meaning is, that I make them no causes. But do you think any Reader will English *Causalitas quædam*, by [*no Causality*] But doubtless you mean that it is *Terminus diminuens* as to the quality or nobility of the cause. But first, I never heard before that *quædam* was *terminus diminuens*, and if no Readers must understand you, but those that know this to be true, I think it will be but few. Secondly, But what if that were so? Did you not know that I denyed even *all causality*, how diminute soever *quædam* can express, if it be but real?

real. Thirdly, But you added [*Concurrence*] But it was in Concurrence with the several unjust passages before mentioned: and sure the neighbour-hood of that word hath not force enough to make them all true.

Preface. [*My Reverend Brother saith, He vehemently disclaimeth all Causality of Works in Justification: surely his meaning is all proper causal efficiency, and so did I in the stating of it: But to deny Causality in a large sense, is to contradict himself.*

Answer. If so, what hope of Justice? Must I in paper after paper disclaim all true Causality, and will you not only perswade the world of the contrary, but persist in it, whether I will or not, and say I mean a [*proper causal efficiency* !] Reader, I have no other remedy left, but to advise thee, that if yet after this it be affirmed the next time that I disclaim not all true causality, or mean not as I say, thou believe not the affirmation.

Preface. [*For in his Aphoris. 74. Thes. They both,* viz. *Faith and Works justifie in the same kind of causality, or mediate it (should be media,) and improper causes, or as* Dr. *Twiss* causæ dispositivæ, *but with this difference, Faith as the principal, Obedience as the less principal. Here is causality, though improper; Here is a* causa dispositiva *: and yet shall I be blamed after I had removed Efficiency and Merit?*

Answer. This is but to add injustice to injustice. When I have written at large that faith and works are no true causes of Justification, and after tell you that a condition is commonly called *causa sine qua non*, which is *causa fatua*, and no cause at all, but meerly nominal, having by custom obtained that name, and that Dr. *Twiss* calls this *causa dispositiva*: when I say that they have only a causality improperly so called, which indeed is no causality. Is it justice for you still to perswade the world that I mean *some causality*, though not *efficiency*? The thing I renounce: the name is not it that you only charge me with: if

you had, I was not the maker of it. It was called *causa sine qua non*, before I was born: I must comply with common language, or be silent: especially when I tell you, I take it for no Cause. You give me such justice as the hoast of the Crown Tavern in *Cheap-side* had, who (as *Speed* saith,) was hanged for saying merrily, that his Son was Heir of the Crown, and his exposition would not save his life. I pray you hereafter remove more then Efficiency and Merit. I take not works to be either the material or formal cause of Justification, no nor the *final*, though you (in the words before cited) affirm it such. Who then gives more to works, you or I? The final cause is so called, because it causeth us to choose the means to it; Justification is not a means of our using, but an act of God. Therefore works are not properly the end of it, as to us.

And yet let me say this to you, lest you should mistake me: As vehemently as I disown all true causality of works to our Justification, I intend not to fall out with all men that call them causes. As first, Not with *Piscator* nor such other that call them causes of our final absolution and salvation. Secondly, Nor with those that call them meritorious in the same sense as the Fathers did, though they unfitly use the word. Thirdly, Nor with those that will say, that because they please God, and so are the object of his complacency and will, they may therefore, speaking after the manner of men, be called *Procatarctike* causes of his act of Justification: and so that the Amiableness and desirableness of faith and holiness, is the cause why he assigned them to this Noble place and office. Fourthly, Nor with them that say, faith is a moral or a Metaphorical, passive or active Instrument of Justification. Though I say not as these men, I will not quarrel with them.

Preface. *But I need not run to this; for my Arguments militate against Works, as Works justifying under any pretended Notion Whatsoever.*

Answer. By the help of this, I shall interpret all your Arguments. And if so, then they militate against the act of faith justifying under the pretended notion of an Instrument, unless you

you will say that faith is no Act, or Instrumentality is no pretended notion.

Preface. *And this maketh me admire how my learned Brother could let fall one passage wherein he may be so palpably and ocularly convinced to the contrary by the first looking upon my Arguments; that which he saith is* [*the strength of my Arguments, lies upon a supposition, that conditions have a moral efficiency*] ——— *There is no one of these ten Arguments brought against Justification by Works, as a* Condition sine qua non, *that is built upon this supposition, or hath any dependance on it, only in the fourth Argument after their strength is delivered, I do* ex abundanti, *shew that a Condition in a Covenant strictly taken hath a moral efficiency.*

Answer. First, You confess it is your Assertion, that such Conditions have a moral efficiency. Secondly, I never said that you made that a *Medium* in all your Arguments, nor that you intended that as their strength; but that their strength lyeth on that supposition; and if I have mistaken in that, I will not stand in it: But I think to shew you that without that supposition your Arguments have no strength: which if I do, then judge at what you marvailed.

But its a farther act of injustice in you, in alleadging me *Apol. pag.* 8. saying that some conditions are impulsive causes, when I told you it is not *qua* conditions, but only as materially there is somewhat in them that is meritorious. I doubt not but the same thing may be the matter of a cause and a condition.

I shall now return to your Lect. of Justification, and there speak to the other passage in your preface, about justifying Repentance and Love, *&c.*

Treat. *pag.* 220. [*This therefore I shall (God willing) undertake to prove, that good works are not a condition, or* a causa sine qua non *of our Justification.*

Answer. But remember that it is Justification, either as be-

gun in constitution, or continued, or as pronounced by the Judges Sentence, that the Question comprehendeth, and not only the putting us into a justified state; And its works under any notion that you speak of, and not only under the reduplication, *quà* works.

Treat. p.221. *First I shall instance in the great pattern and example of our Justification*, Abraham; *from whom the Apostle concludeth a Justification of all Believers in the like manner he was. Now that* Abraham *was not Justified by Works, or his working, though a godly man, the Apostle*, &c.

Answ. 1. I distinguish between works in *Pauls* sense, and *works* in *Iames* his sense. And because you say so much against distinguishing of *works*, (before) as deceitful; I will first prove the necessity of distinguishing. 1. Works in *Paul's* sense are such as make the Reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt. Works in *Iames* his sense are not such: therefore they are not the same. Works in *Pauls* sense, are *actions as valuable offered to God*, and justifying by their value But works in *Iames* his sense, are none such. Proved. The works that *James* speaks of must necessarily be done: Works in *Pauls* sense, we may not so much as imagine that we can do; *viz.* such as make the Reward of Debt, and not of Grace. Though the matter of such works may be done, which Justiciaries thus conceive of, yet under such a notion, no man may once imagine that he hath them.

2. Works in *Pauls* sense are such as stand in competition with Christ, or at least, would be co-partners with him in a co-ordination. But works in *James* his sense are none such, but such as stand in a due subordination to Christ; such undoubtedly there are: And such *James* speaks of.

That *Paul* speaks of works as Competitors with Christ, or as co-ordinate, an hundred Texts will prove; and the case is so plain, that I think it not worth the insisting on, seeing the impartial reading over the Epistles may satisfie.

2. I distinguish of *Justifying*, *quoad modum procurandi*, or of the distinct Interests of mens actions therein, signified in the prepositon [*By.*] *Paul* speaks of Justification [*By*] works,

works, as *by valuable* deserving causes, or procatar-tike causes, moving God to justifie us by their worth, or by some true causality *procuring* it. But *James* speaks of Works as supposing the perfect Satisfaction and Merit of Christ, and that all that is valuable to the causal procurement of our Justification is to be found in him alone, and therefore he leaves no causality herein to works; but takes them as a meer condition, which cease suspending when performed. For the efficiency of a condition, is only in suspending till performed: And so Rebellion can suspend; when the ceasing of that Rebellion by obedience, doth not cause; but only cease suspending.

Now I answer to your *Minor*, that *Abraham* was not justified by works in *Pauls* sense, but he was in *James's* sense, unless you will own the saying which you chide *Althamer* for. (Though I must say that in his *Conciliationes Loc. Script. Althamer* deals more mannerly with *James.*) *Abraham* was not justified by works, as making the Reward of debt, and not of grace: for he had no such works: But *Abraham* was justified 1. By the act of faith, as a condition: therefore by an act under some notion. I know of few Divines that deny that faith is a condition of Justification. 2. However you confess your self that *Abraham* was Justified by faith as an instrument: and you say that it was by the act of faith (and not the habit.) And though you take this to be but a nominal act, and really a Passion, yet so do not others: for herein you are more singular (a thousand to one, as far as I am able to understand) then I am in the Doctrine which you charge with singularity. 3. The faith that *Abraham* was justified by, was not only a bare apprehension of Christs Righteousness, but a receiving of Christ as Christ, which is called, *Works*, by your party. 4. It was either *By* or *Because* of his External Obedience, that *Abraham* was justified. Proved. 1 By *James* 2. 21. Was not *Abraham* our Father justified by works, when he had offered *Isaac* his son upon the Altar? 2. From *Gen.* 22. 12, 16, 18. *By my self have I sworn saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not with-held thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee*, &c. *And in thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.* But then I must add, that this

this was none of *Abrahams* first Justification, for he was just before this; but it was a renewed Acceptance and Approbation of God, and a kind of sentential Declaration thereof, by the voice of the Angel. But a Justification it was, and so *James* calls it.

Now let us hear your Replies.

Treat. pag. 221. *This cannot be a solid Answer.* 1. *Because the Apostle speaketh generally of works in this description of Justification, though in other places he sometimes saith* [the works of the Law] *yet* Abraham *could not be Instanced in for such Works*, &c. —— *When We read the Holy Ghost spake generally of all Works, who are We that We should limit it to some?* —— *By their interpretation, the believer should be opposed only to some kind of works and faith*, &c.

Answ. 1, The ordinary strain of the Apostles speech, being expressive of the *works of the Law*, is Expository of the rest, 1. Because a few passages must be usually expounded by many. 2. And because a few (much more abundance of) limiting passages, must expound those where the restriction is not expressed.

2. Have not I ever yielded to you that all works are excluded from Justifying as works? but it follows not that therefore they are (as you may say) excluded under any Notion whatsoever.

3. And why might not *Abraham* be instanced in? Your proof is none. 1. Is it not a good Argument *Negative*, *Abraham* was not justified by works, therefore we are not? And a good Argument to prove the Antecedent: Because he had no works that could justifie: No nor those which were then trusted on to Justification. 2. Doth not *Paul* shew that he speaks of these, when he proves his assertion, 1. Because *Abraham* was then in uncircumcision, *Rom.* 4. 10. (what's that to Gospel obedience?) 2. Because the Law was long after the promise, and was not then given, *Gal.* 3. 17. 3. *Paul* maketh it all one to be justified by works, and to be justified by the Law; as abundance of passages shew. A multitude of particular Texts do expresly

expresly shew that it is a Legal Justification only that he speaks of, and that he directly intendeth only Legal works. I will now instance but in one, *viz.* *Rom.* 4. 13. compared with *Gen.* 22. 18. [*For the promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to* Abraham *and his seed by the Law, but through the righteousness of faith.*] Now compare with this, the words of the promise it self, [*And in thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.*] So ver. 16, 17. *Because thou hast done this thing*, &c.]

4. Its not easie to conceive how any man can expect a Legal or Pharisaical Justification by Evangelical works without a gross contradiction: For example; to be justified Legally by Evangelical faith, desire, love, thanks, joy, self-denyal, confession, *&c.* are all palpable contradictions: And such a mans faith must be thus expresst; *I expect to merit Justification legally, by believing in Christ as the sole Meriter of my Justification and salvation, or by desiring Christ, or by loving Christ as the sole Meriter of my salvation: Or by thanking him, or rejoycing in him as the Sole-meriter of my salvation: Or I expect legally to merit Justification, by denying that I can merit it, by any righteousness of my own; or by confessing that I deserve damnation by my sins, or by praying or seeking for salvation by free gift, as merited only by Christ.*] All these are palpable contradictions; and no man can hold both that knoweth what he doth.

5. Yet I will suppose that though no man can so trust to his works for legal Justification, that are apprehended by him as *Formally* Evangelical, yet perhaps he may do it by some works that are *Materially* Evangelical, and fancied by him to be what they are not. And so I still say, that though it were Legal works that *Paul* did directly dispute against, yet consequentially and indirectly he disputeth against works commanded only in the Gospel, if men will do them to Legal ends, and fancy them to be of the value legally to justifie them.

6. I will therefore suppose some men to be so unreasonable, as to expect a Legal Justification, by their believing or confessing that Christ only can Legally justifie them, and not themselves; and so I will grant you, that *Paul* doth (consequentially) exclude *all works*, even Evangelical works from Justifica-

tion: But though he exclude *all works*, yet not in every notion, nor doth he exclude *All interest* of All works in our Justification. All works as *valuable offerings*, he excludes, and so as meritorious, not only in point of Commutative Justice, but also in point of Legal worth and Legal Justice, as the Pharisees supposed them meritorious: All works he excludes from all proper Causality. But he doth not exclude all works from having any Interest at all in subordination to Christ. Do you verily believe that Repentance and Faith have no Interest in our Pardon, in sub-ordination to Christ? If you say, *No, not any*, you contradict God, and your self, and all the Christian world. If you say, *Yea, but they justifie not* qua *works*; you say nothing to the controversie: For I have over and over as loud as you, professed that they justifie not *formaliter* as works. If you say they have any Interest: 1. Tell us better what it is. 2. And then you confute your general assertion. There's no Christian that I know but will confess that the Gospel works have the interest of Declaring *signs* in our final Iustification. And few will deny that Repentance hath the interest of a necessary qualification, or condition to our first Justification. Now would you perswade us that *Paul* excludeth this kind of Interest, or oppoſeth faith to it? If not against the *signal* interest of works, then not against all Interest; therefore if *Pauls* general exclusion will consist with your *signal* Interest, then I shall maintain that it will consist with the fore-explained *Conditional* interest.

I will not therefore be guilty of your charge of limiting the Holy Ghost. If he spake of all works, I will believe he means *All works*. But 1. If he over and over near an hundred times at least, explain himself as speaking of the Law, I will not shut my ears against that explication. And 2. I will grant it is also *all Evangelical Works*, at least by consequence: But I need not therefore grant that because he excludeth *All Works*, therefore he excludeth *All kind* of *Interest* of all works; but only that sort which he disputeth against.

Besides all this, I must distinguish of *Justification*, *Legal* and *Evangelical*, respective to the promises and threatnings of the Law and Gospel, which do differ. No works at all did justifie *Abraham*, from the charge of the Law, *Thou art a sinner*,

as

as being the Righteousnes of the Law, and the matter of that Justification. Nor will any works at all so justifie us. But it doth not follow, that therefore no works will justifie a man from the false accusation of being an Impenitent, Unbeliever, and so having no part in Christ, whose Righteousnes must stop the mouth of the Law: Or that no works are the matter of the righteousnes required in this Constitution, [*He that believeth shall be saved: Repent that your sins may be blotted out.*] Which are here required as the condition of our freedom from the Law, by the righteousnes of Christ. In a word, *Paul* bestows a large dispute to prove that no works of ours do answer the expectation of the Law, and so cannot justifie us themselves from its Accusation. Its an ill consequence, that therefore *Paul* proveth that no works of mans do answer the special constitution or condition of the Gospel [*Repent and Believe in Christ*, &c.] and so are not the Condition of our interest in that perfect righteousnes of Christ, which is the only *valuable* cause of our forefaid Justification.

Treat. 222. *Again, that works of all sorts are excluded, is plain, if you consider the Object of Justification, who it is that is here said to be justified, and that is, the ungodly. By the* ungodly *is one meant that hath not a sufficient and adequate holiness: so that* Abraham *though regenerated, yet as to Justification is ungodly, he cannot stand before God, or endure, if all his imperfections be enquired after. Now certainly he that fulfilleth the conditions of Justification, cannot be called ungodly; for he doth all that is required.*

Answ. 1. Again, I grant all works excluded: but not in all their relations; nor are all their Interests in Justification excluded. 2. This Argument I should not have expected from you. You confess that by *ungodly*, is meant such, though Regenerate and holy, that have not an adequate holiness: Adequate; To what? to the Law? or to the constitution of the condition in the Gospel? Marvel not if I deny the Consequence of your Argument, and if I be unable to digest your reason for it. You say, [*He that fulfilleth the Condition of Justification, cannot be called ungodly.*] But what *Condition?* I confess he that

fulfilleth the *Laws* condition cannot be called *ungodly*, nor be unjustifiable by that Law. But he that performeth the *Gospel*-Condition of liberation, may be called *ungodly* in the sense you now mentioned, that is, unjustifiable immediatly for his works by the Law: or one that hath not an holiness adequate to the Law. Though indeed he cannot be called *Evangelically ungodly*. I suppose you clearly see that your Argument makes as much against any Condition of Justification in us, as against works being the condition. For against faith it self, being any Condition, you may equally argue, [*Its the ungodly that are justified: But he that fulfilleth the conditions of Justification, is not to be called ungodly.* Ergo, *&c.*] But if you take *ungodliness* (as you do) for unadequate holiness (to the Law) I deny your Minor. Can no man but the Perfectly obedient, perform the condition of pardon in the Gospel?

Treat. ib. *So that this is very considerable, that all those whom God justifieth, he justifieth them not for any thing they have of their own, or any conditions they have performed; but as such who are sinners in a strict examination, and so deserve condemnation, and therefore no works of grace are looked upon.*

Answ. I have answered this fully in *Colvinus*. 1. Though Protestants oft say, that God saveth men *for* their obedience, and Scripture use the term [*because*] oft, yet I am willing to yield to you that men be not saved nor justified *for* any thing of their own, or *for* any conditions: But yet he would *not justifie* them *without* the performance of some conditions; but would condemn them *for* the non-performance, even with a special condemnation, distinct from that which is *for* their sins against the Law.

2. *Colvinus* was the first man, and you are the second that ever I read (to my remembrance) saying that God justifieth men *as sinners*. *A quatenus ad omne valet consequentia.* If *as sinners*, then all *sinners* are justified. If not as performers of any Condition, then not *as* Believers! These things want proof.

Treat.

Treat. ib. *Lastly, that all works are excluded, is evident by the Apostles allegation out of* David, *who makes mans blessedness to be in this, that God imputeth righteousness without works.*

Answ. 1. This is sufficiently answered in the former. 2. *Paul* hence immediately concludeth that Righteousness comes not only on the Circumcision: whence you may see what works he means. 3. Your selves expound the foregoing term *ungodly*, of men that have not *adequate* holiness, though sincere; therefore you must so take this equipollent term [*without works*] for [*without that adequate holiness*]: but it follows not, that therefore its without any humane act. 4. Yet still I grant this also, that its without any humane act, considered as the matter of a Legal righteousness, or as opposite to Christ, or co ordinate with him: but not without any humane act, as subordinate to Christ, and as the matter of that Evangelical righteousness which is required in this Constitution [*Repent and Believe the Gospel*] *viz.* sincerely.

Treat. pag. 223. *And indeed it is at last confessed, that its faith only that makes the contract between God and the soul: that good works are not required to this initial consenting unto Christ, so as to make him ours, but in the progress. This is that in effect, which the Papists affirm in other words, That the first Justification is only by faith, but the second by good works.*

Answ. How would you have your Reader understand these two insinuations? 1. Have I so oft asserted that which you call my Confession, and put it into an *Index* of distinctions, lest it should be over-lookt, and told you as much so long ago in private writings, and do you now come out with an [*Its at last confessed*] I hope you would not intimate that ever I denyed it: or that ever I wrote Book of that subject, wherein I did not expresly averre it. But then (that you think not better of me then I deserve) I must tell you, that when I still excluded works from our *begun* Justification, it was external Obedience, and not Repentance, nor those acts of faith (even the Recei-

ving Christ as Lord and Teacher) which those that oppose me call works.

2. If you take it but for an argument to convince such as I, that [*the Papists hold it*: Ergo, *&c.*] I must complain that it is uneffectual: But if you intend it for another effect on other persons, *viz.* to affright them with the sound of so horrid a name, or drive them away by the stink of it, then you may possibly attain your ends. But you should have attempted it only by truth. Is it true, that [*this is that in effect, which the Papists affirm in other words?*] Yea is it not a notorious truth, that *it is quite another thing which the Papists affirm in somewhat like words?* 1. The world knows that the Papists by the first Justification mean the first infusion of renewing special grace. 2. And that by the second Justification, they mean, the adding of further degrees of Sanctification, or actuating that which before was given. 3. That they hold, faith justifieth in the first Justification *constitutivè*. 4. And that works or holiness justifie *constitutivè* in the second Justification, even as *Albedo facit album, vel doctrina indita facit doctum.* On the other side, I have told you often privately and publikely, that, 1. By Justification I mean not Sanctification, nor any Physical, but a Relative change. 2. That by first and second, I mean not two states, or works, but the same state and works as begun, and as continued. 3. That faith justifieth neither *constitutivè & inhærenter*, nor as any cause, but as a Receiving Condition. 4. And that works of external obedience are but a dispositive condition, and an exclusion of that ingratitude that would condemn. And now judge on second thoughts, whether you here speak the words of Truth or Equity.

Treat. ib. *Against this general exclusion of all Works, is opposed* ver. 4. *where the Apostle saith,* To him that worketh the Reward is of debt; *from whence they gather that Works only which are debts, are excluded.*

Answ. I never used or heard such a collection. All good works are debts to God; but our collection is, that works which are supposed by men to make the reward of Debt, and not of Grace, are excluded.

Treat.

Treat. *But if this be seriously thought on, it makes strongly against them; for the Apostles Argument is* à Genere: *if it be by Works, its of Debt: therefore there are not works of Debt, and Works of no Debt.*

Answ. 1. If the Apostle argue *à Genere*, then he argueth not from an Equivocal term; and therefore of no works but what fall under his *Genus*. 2. And the Apostles *Genus* cannot be any thing meerly Physical, because his subject and discourse is moral: and therefore it is not every act that he excludeth. 3. Nor can it be every Moral Act that is his *Genus*: but only *Works* in the notion that he useth the word; that is, All such Works as Workmen do for hire, who expect to receive wages for the worth or desert of their works.

I shall therefore here confute your assertion, and shall prove that *All works do not make the Reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace:* and consequently that *Paul* meaneth not either every Act, or every Moral Act, here; but only works supposed Rewardable for their value! (What you mean by *Works of Debt*, and *Works not of Debt*, I know not: they are not Scripture words, nor my words; For still I say, All Good works are of Debt to God from man.)

Argument 1. *Ex natura rei*; There are many Moral Acts that make not the Reward *from men* to be of Debt, and not of Grace: Much less will such Works make the Reward from God to be of Debt, and not of Grace. The Consequence is grounded on these two or three Reasons. 1. God is infinitely above us; and therefore less capable of being obliged by our works then man. 3. God is our absolute Proprietary, and we are wholly his; and therefore we can give him nothing but his own. 3. God is our Supreme Rector, and we are bound to a perfect fulfilling of his Law: and we are sinners that have broak that Law, and deserve eternal death: therefore we are less capable of obliging him by our works as our Debtor, then of obliging men (and indeed uncapable.) 4. Gods Reward is Eternal Glory, and mans is but some transitory thing: therefore we are less capable of making God our Debtor for Justifi-

cation.

cation and Salvation, then man for a trifle. This proves the Consequence.

Now the Antecedent I prove by Instances. 1. If a man be ready to drown in the water, and you offer to help him out, if he will lay hold of your hand: this act of his is *Actus humanus vel moralis*, and yet makes not the deliverance to be of Debt, and not of Grace. 2. If a man be in prison for Debt and you ransom him, and offer him deliverance on condition he will but consent to come forth on the account of your Ransom: this moral Action makes not his Deliverance to be of Debt, and not of Grace. 3. If a man be condemned for Treason, and upon Ransom made, you procure and offer him a pardon, on condition he will take it; or if you say, *If you will give me thanks for it, or take it thankfully*; or, *If also you confess your Treason*; or, *If also you crave pardon of the Prince*; or, *If also you confess me your benefactor*; or, *If also you will profess your purpose to take up rebellious arms no more*; or, *If also you will openly profess the Princes Soveraignty, and renounce the Leaders of the Rebells, whom you have followed*; *Upon any one, or on all these conditions, you shall have a free and full pardon; without any cost or suffering of your own.* Do you think that any of these do make the pardon to be of Debt, and not of Grace? 4. If you give a man a Lordship on condition he take it as a free Gift from you, and pay you yearly a grain of sand, or do some act of homage (as to say I thank you) which hath in it no consideration of value, but only of acknowledgement of dependance, doth this make your Gift to be not of Grace? 5. If you give a beggar a piece of gold, on condition he will take it, and put off his hat, and say, I thank you. I will not believe, that any of these Acts do make the Reward to be not of Grace. But if you bid them, *Go and do me so many daies work for it*, importing somewhat profitable or valuable for your self, then the case is altered.

Argument 2. Those works which a man cannot be justified without, make not the Reward to be of debt and not of Grace: But there are some works that a man cannot be justified without, *Jam.* 2. 24. *Matthew* 12. 37. what ever they be, some they are.

Argument

Argument 3. Thoſe works which a man cannot be ſaved without, make not the Reward to be of Debt and not of Grace. But there are ſome works that we cannot be ſaved without. Therefore there are ſome works that make not the Reward of Debt and not of Grace.

The Major is proved by the expreſs excluſion of works in this ſenſe, from ſalvation: both as begun, and as conſummate, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath ſaved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but his own purpoſe and grace,* &c. Epheſ. 2. 8, 9. *For by Grace ye are ſaved, through faith, and not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God: not of works, leſt any man ſhould boaſt,* Tit. 3. 5, 6, 7. *Not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt,* ——— that being juſtified by his Grace, we ſhould be made Heirs according to the hope of eternal life, *Rom.* 6. 23. *For the wages of ſin is death, but the Gift of God is eternal life through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord,*] Act. 4. 12. *Neither is there ſalvation in any other,* Mat. 25. 34. *Come ye bleſſed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you,* &c.] whence Expoſitors conclude againſt works.

The Minor may be proved by an hundred texts, *Mat.* 25. 35. *For I was hungry,* &c. *Rev.* 22. 12. and 2. 23. *Mark* 13. 34. *Rev.* 20. 13. *Jam.* 2 14. 1 *Pet.* 1. 17. *He will judge every man according to his works,* &c.

Argument 4. Thoſe works which Grace commandeth, and cauſeth the Godly to perform, do not make the Reward to be not of Grace, but of debt. But there are ſome ſuch works. *Ergo,* &c.

The Major is evident: What Saint dare ſay, that he hath a work that makes not the Reward of Grace, eſpecially when it is a work of Grace?

The Minor is as true as Scripture is true, 2 *Cor.* 9. 8. *Col.* 1. 10. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 17. 2 *Tim.* 2. 21. *Tit.* 3. 1. *Heb.* 13. 21. *Mat.* 5. 16. *Heb.* 10. 24. 1 *Pet.* 2. 12. *Tit.* 2. 14. and 3. 8, 14. *Epheſ.* 2. 10. &c. —— Dare any ſay that God hath not commanded good works? or yet, that he hath commanded us in the Goſpel, ſo to

work that the Reward may not be of grace, but debt? Will any say that the Saints do no good works? or else that they do such good works as make the Reward to be not of Grace but of debt? I hope not.

Argument 5. Repentance is a moral Act: Repentance maketh not the Reward to be of debt, and not of grace: therefore there are some works that make not the Reward to be not of grace, but of Debt. The same I say of Faith it self, and other Acts.

But perhaps some one else will object, that though its true that there be such works, yet they have no Intereſt in the buſineſs of our Juſtification, and therefore *Paul* doth hence exclude them. *Anſwer.* Firſt, It ſufficed to my laſt purpoſe to prove that there are works which will not bear his deſcription, and therefore are not they that he means. Secondly, But that thoſe other works have some Intereſt in the buſineſs of our Juſtification, I have proved in the beginning. Repentance hath the promiſe of Pardon: ſo hath faith, *&c.* But I'le not unſeaſonably here digreſs to this, but refer you to what is ſaid before and after, and elſewhere more at large.

Argu. 6. In ver. 5, the oppoſite term [he that worketh not] doth not ſignifie him that performeth no moral act. Therefore in the fourth verſe, [he that worketh] doth not ſignifie him that doth perform any moral act. The conſequence is undeniable from the evident immediate oppoſition, between him that worketh, and him that worketh not. The Antecedent I prove, Firſt, From the words of the Text, which mention one act, even believing, as oppoſite to working, and implyed in, or conſiſtent with not working. [To him that worketh not, but believeth.] Secondly, Becauſe elſe it would ſubvert the Goſpel. What ſenſe would you make of it if you ſhould interpret this and ſuch texts as this of all moral Acts? Such as Chriſtian ears would abhor. If [working] be the *Genus*, and the Text will hold as extended to Believing, Repenting, *&c.* as the *ſpecies*, and that even in their due Evangelical notion: Let us try them a little in ſuch an Expoſition. *ver.* 4,5. [to him that worketh, that is, Repenteth, Believeth, *&c.* the Reward is not of Grace, but of Debt. But to him that worketh not, (that

is,

is, that Repenteth not, Loveth not God, Desireth not Christ or Grace, believeth not in Christ,) but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith (supposing he have it not) is imputed to him for righteousness.] Is this a sweet and Christian sense? If we should run over an hundred such Texts by such an Interpretation, you would hear no sweeter Melody.

Let us hear some modern Expositors, (for I will give you no thanks to grant me the Ancients, without citing them)

1. *Calvin*, (that excellent Expositor) saith thus, [*Operantem vocat qui suis meritis aliquid promeretur: non operantem, cui nihil debetur operum merito. Neque enim fideles vult esse ignavos; sed tantum Mercenarios esse vetat, qui à Deo quicquam reposcant, quasi jure Debitum.*] Is not this one of the Opinionists, that so far joyneth with the *Socinians* and *Papists*?

2. *Bullinger* (and *Marlorate* citing him) makes the Apostle to argue thus [*Si quis sit qui promereatur aliquid opere suo, res promerita, non imputatur illi gratis; sed ut debita redditur: Fides reputatur in justitiam, non quod aliquod tale promereamur, sed quia Domini bonitatem apprehendimus. Ergo,* &c.

3. *Beza*: *Atqui ei qui operatur,* τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ: *Id est, ei qui ex opere sit aliquid promeritus. Cui opponitur,* ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος, *qui non operatur, id est, qui opus nullum adfert cujus mercedem flagitet, sed gratuita Dei promissione nititur —— Justificatio enim gratia est in Christo, ista vero Meriti est in nobis.*

4. *Piscator* in Schol. *Sic argumentatur* Paulus: *Ei qui operibus meretur, merces non imputatur.* ver. 4. *Atqui* Abrahamo *justitia fuit imputata*; ver. 3. *Ergo* Abrahamus *justitiam non est meritus operibus.*

5. *Peter Martyr* also is a down right Opinionist; *In loc.* pag. (*miki*) 168. *Et cum audimus à* Paulo, *Operanti & non operanti, nequaquam sic accipere debemus, quasi illi qui credunt non operentur. Nam de illa tantum operatione loquitur, qua mereamur, aut mereri velimus justitiam. Et hoc loco consideratu dignum est, quod apud Theologos scholasticos jam inveteravit ut dicant meritum à* Paulo *appellari debitum: Quare cum hic*

Paulus *à Justificatione debitum auferet, necessariò etiam tollit meritum, si propriè ac verè de illo velimus loqui.*

6. Aretius *in loc. Tertium Argumentum ex vi relativorum, opera postulant mercedem suo jure ac debito non ex gratia, sed* Abrahamo *justitia debito, non suo jure, sed ex gratia est collata:* Ergo, *&c.* ——— ver. 5. *Nam si opera non opus fuisset imputatione, sed tanquam ὀφείλημα postulasset meritorum suorum debitum mercedem.*

7. *Anton. Fayus* in loc. *Argumentatur Apostolus ex locati & conducti inter homines recepto jure: qui enim locat operam suam, pascisitur cum conductore, ut congruens operæ pretium ipsi numeretur: adeo ut non obtineat mercedem gratis, sed ex opera cum ipsa mercede ἀνάλογία* ——— *Argumentum ergo est à disparatis: sunt enim disparata merces & donum, ut & operans & non operans. Operans accipit mercedem debitam: non operans accipit donum. Est enim inter Deum & homines ἀναλογία illa quæ est inter donantem & donatarium.* ——— *Quod ad nomen mercedis spectat, apparet illam duplicem esse: nempe mercedem debitam ex proportione operæ cum re, per proportionem Geometricam: ut cum operario pro diurna opera datur quod æquum est, ex mutuo stipulatu.* (This he thinks is here meant) *Alia merces est non debita, sed gratuita: estq; tanquam fructus vel commodum quoddam* ——— (This he thinks not here meant.)

Operantem vocat illum qui legis operibus Justitiam venatur: non quod unquam ullus extiterit qui sic operatus est, ut mercedem debitam merito possit postulare, sed ex hypothesi loquitur, hoc modo; si quis operaretur ut decet, mercedem debitam posset exigere.

8. *Dav. Pareus* in loc. *Explicat quid sit fidem imputari pro justitia: minime videlicet idem quod actum vel opus fidei suo merito reputari pro justitia (sic enim nihil confecisset,) sed credenti justitiam ex gratia imputari nullo merito aut debito* ——— *Operantem non vocat eum qui bona opera facit, sed qui bonis operibus confidit, justitiam quærit, seu qui operatur debita mercedis causa. Nam & credentes bona operantur, non vero ut Mercenarii: nec operibus Justitiam & vitam mereri volunt. Qui enim sic operatur excluditur à gratia, &c.* ——— *Ita, inquit, res habet inter*

inter homines : qui laborat pro mercede, in vinea, militia, rure, vel domi, ei merces per acto labore non imputatur vel donatur ex gratia, sed redditur ex debito ut meritum ; idque ex ordine justitiæ συναλλαγῆς quæ sancit æqualitatem Arithmeticam laboris & mercedis. Talis enim labor est meritus, opus indebitum, mercedem ex indebita faciens debitam propter justitiam. —— Abrahæ *igitur promissa & imputatio fuit justitiæ merces, nullo operum merito, sed mera gratia.* —— *Qui vero non operatur, nempe pro mercede, h. e. qui non quærit Justitiam operum meritis.*

9. Dr. *Willet* in loc. Q. 12. *By him that worketh is understood, him that worketh with an intent thereby to merit or to be justified : For he that believeth also worketh ; but he is said, not to work* secundum quid, *because he doth it not to the end to merit by.*

10. *Dav. Dickson* in loc. *Ratio 3. Mercenaria operanti, seu Justitiam ex operibus quærenti, merces non potest esse gratuita, sed ex debito seu merito retribuenda est.*

11. *Cartwright* cont. Rhem. in loc. *For if the Reward should be given according to Works, God should be a Debtor unto man : But it is absurd to make God a Debtor to man. 2. He speaketh not of that Reward that ignorant men challenge to themselves ; but of the Reward that God should in justice give, if men had deserved it by their works.*

12. *Hemingius* (even a *Lutheran*) *supposeth the Argument to be thus. Imputatio gratuita non est operantis merces : justitia credentis est imputatio gratuita : ergo justitia credentis non est operantis merces. Major probatur per contrarium ; Merces operanti, id est, ei qui aliquid operibus promeretur, datur ex debito.* —— *Probatio hæc per concessionem Rhetoricam intelligenda est. Nequaquam enim* Paulus *sentit, quod quisquam ex debito fiat justus revera, sed quæ sit natura rerum indicat* —— *Imputare est aliquid gratia conferre, non ex debito tribuere.* —— *Merces proprie est quod debebatur ex merito : hoc est, Debiti solutio.*

Yea in his blow at the Majorists he confesseth the truth [8. *Evertitur eorum dogma, qui clamant, opera necessaria ad salutem, quæ salus cum a justificatione separari nequit, non ha-*

bet alias causas aut merita, quam ipsa Justificatio. Hoc tamen fatendum est, quod opera necessariò requirantur in Justificatis, ut iter intermedium, non ut causa aut merita.

13. *Mich. Ragerus* (*a Lutheran*) in loc. *Imputatio fidei opponitur imputationi ex merito; imputatio fidei fit secundum gratiam: E. fides in negotio Justificationis, non consideratur ut opus morale: quid enim per modum operis imputatur, secundum debitum & meritoriè imputatur* ——— [*Et qui operatur*] *sive operans renatus sit, sive non, dummodo eâ intentione operetur, eoque fine, ut mercedem reportet & opera sua censorio Dei judicio opposita velit.*

14. In like manner *Georg. Calixtus* (*a Lutheran*) *in loc.* pag. 26,28,&c.

To these I might add many other Protestant Expositors, and the votes of abundance of Polemical Divines, who tell the Papists that in *Pauls* sense its all one [to be justified by works: to be justified by the Law: and to be justified by merits.]

But this much may suffice for the vindication of that Text, and to prove that all works do not make the Reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace, but only meritorious mercenary works, and not those of gratitude, *&c.* beforenamed.

Treat. *ibid.* [*The second Argument may be from the peculiar and express difference that the Scripture giveth between faith and other graces, in respect of Justification. So that faith and good works are not to be considered as concurrent in the same manner, though one primarily, the other secondarily: so that if faith when its said to Justifie, doth it not as a condition, but in some other peculiar notion, which works are not capable of, then we are not Justified by works as well as faith. Now its not lightly to be passed over that the Scripture still useth a peculiar expression of faith, which is incommunicable to other graces. Thus* Rom. 3.25. *Remission of sins is through faith in his blood*, Rom. 4. 5. *Faith is counted for Righteousness*, Rom. 5.1. Galatians 2.16. *&c.*

Answer. First, This is nothing to the Question, and deserves no

no further answer. The Question is not now whether faith and works justifie in the same manner: thats but a consequent (rightly explained) of another thing in question; your self hath here made it the question, whether Works be Conditions of Justification? And that which I affirmed is before explained. I grant, that if faith justifie not as a condition, but *proxime* in any other respect, then Faith and Repentance, *&c.* justifie not in the same manner: so that the sameness of their Interest in the general notion of a condition, supposeth faith to be a condition; but if you can prove that it is not, I shall grant the difference which you prove. Now it is not our question here, whether faith be a condition, or an Instrument; but whether other works (as you choose to call them) or humane acts be conditions.

Secondly, Scripture taketh not faith in the same sense as my Opposers do, when it gives it the peculiar expressions that you mention. Faith in *Pauls* sense, is a Belief in Jesus Christ (in all the respects essential to his person and office) and so a hearty Acceptance of him for our Teacher, Lord and Saviour; (Saviour I say both from the guilt and power of sin) and as one that will lead us by his word and spirit into Possession of eternal Glory which he hath purchased.] So that it includeth many acts of Assent, and a Love to our Saviour, and desire of him; and it implyeth self-denial, and renouncing our own righteousness, and all other Saviours, and a sense of our sin and misery, at least, as Antecedents or concomitants; and sincere Affiance and Obedience in gratitude to our Redeemer, as necessary consequents: And this faith is set by *Paul*, in opposition to the bare doing of the works of *Moses* Law (and consequently of any other works with the same intention) as separated from Christ who was the end and life of it, or at least, co-ordinate with him; and so as the immediate matter of a legal Righteousness; and consequently as mercenary, and valuable in themselves, or meritorious of the Reward. This is *Pauls* faith. But the faith disputed for by my Opponents, is the Act of recumbency or Affiance on Christ at Justifier or Priest, which they call the Apprehension of Christs righteousness; and this as opposed to the Acceptance of Christ as our Teacher and King, our Husband,

band, Head, &c. (further then these contain his Priesthood:) and opposed to Repentance, to the love of our Saviour, to denying our own righteousness, confessing our sins, and confessing Christ to be our only Saviour, Thankfulness for free grace, &c. all which are called *works* by these men, and excluded from being so much as Conditions attending faith in our Justification or Remission of sin.

The case may be opened by this similitude. A Physitian cometh to a populous City in an Epidemical Plague: There is none can scape without his help: he is a stranger to them, and they have received false informations and apprehensions of him that he is but a mountebank and deceiver, though indeed he came of purpose in love and compassion to save their lives, having a most costly receipt which will certainly cure them. He offereth himself to be their Physitian, and freely to give them his Antidote, and to cure and save them, if they will but consent, that is, if they will take him for their Physitian, and thankfully take his medicine; His enemies disswade the people from believing in him, and tell them that he is a Deceiver, and that if they will but stir themselves, and work, and use such dyet and medicines as they tell them of, they shall do better without him; and a third party that seem to be friends, tell them, though you do take him for your Physitian, yet must you work your self to health, and take those other medicines as well as his, if you will be cured. But the Physitian saith, its only your trusting in me that can cure you. Now here we are at a loss in the interpreting of his conditions. Some say, that they must be cured barely by believing or trusting in him, and not by taking his person in the full relation of a Physitian, or at least, not by taking his medicine, which they abhor, nor by exercising or sweating upon it, or observing the dyet and directions which he giveth them. But I rather interpret him thus; in requiring you to take him for your Physitian, it is implyed, that you must take his medicines, how bitter soever, and that you must order your selves according to his directions, and must not take cold, nor eat or drink that which he forbiddeth you; for though it be only his precious medicine that can cure you, yet if you will take those things that are destructive to you, it may hinder the working of it, and an ill

dyet

dyet or disordered life may kill you. The working therefore that he excluded, was not this implyed observance of his directions, but your own Receipts and Labourings, as aboveſaid.

3. I further answer to your observation, that the same Scripture that saith, [*We are justified by faith*] doth also say, that *Except ye Repent, ye shall all perish*, *Luke* 13. 3, 5. And *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Iesus Christ for the Remission of sins*, Acts 2. 38. and mentioneth the *Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of sin*; and joyneth the *preaching of Repentance and Remission*, *Luke* 24. 47. *Repent and be Converted, that your sins may be blotted out*, &c. *Luke* 6. 37. *Forgive and it shall be forgiven you*, *Jam.* 5. 15. *The prayer of faith shall save the sick —— and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him*, *Mat.* 6. 14, 15. *If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you; but if you forgive not*, &c. *Mark* 11. 11, 25. *Forgive, that your Father may forgive you.* 1 *Iohn* 1. 9. *If We confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins*, &c. *Isa.* 55. 6, 7, &c. And he that saith, *We are Justified by faith*, saith also, that [*by works a man is justified, and not by faith only*;] and that [*by our words we shall be justified.*]

4. Lastly, to your argument from the peculiar attributions to faith, I say, that we do accordingly give it its prerogative, as far as those attributions do direct us, and would do more, if it were not for fear of contradicting the Scripture.

Treat. pag. 224. *From these expressions it is that our Orthodox Divines say, that faith justifieth as it is an Instrument, laying hold on Christ*, &c. ad pag. 226.

Answ. Though I could willingly dispatch with one man at once, yet because it is the matter more then the person, that must be considered, I must crave your Patience as to the Answering of this Paragraph, till I come to the Dispute about faiths Instrumentality, to which it doth belong, that so I may not trouble the present Dispute by the Interposition of another.

Treat. pag 226 *The third Argument is, If in the continuance and progress of our Justification we are justified after the same manner we were at first, then its not by faith and works, but by faith only as distinct to works*, Rom. 1. 17. Galat. 3. 11. ———

Answ. 1. I grant the whole, understanding faith and works as *Paul* doth, but not as you do.

2. By [*the same manner*] either you mean, [*the same specifically* (as specified from the Covenant and Object) as distinct from Jewish Righteousnes, or from all false waies, or all Mercenary meritorious works (so intended), or any *manner* that is not subordinate to Christ, and implyed in Believing] And thus your Antecedent is true, and your Consequence (in your sense of faith and works) is false; Or else you mean [*the same manner*] in opposition to any additional act implyed in our first believing as its necessary Consequent.] And thus your Minor or Antecedent is false. If you will not believe me, believe your self, who as flatly spake the contrary Doctrine, as ever I did, being not as it seems in every Lecture of the same thoughts; *pag.* 118. you write it for observation in a different Character, thus [*For though holy works do not justifie, yet by them a man is continued in a state of Justification: so that did not the Covenant of grace interpose, gross and wicked waies would cut off our Justification, and put us in a state of Condemnation.*] But because you may avoid your own authority at pleasure many waies, I shall give you a better authority that cannot be avoided.

1. In our first Justification, we were not *justified by our words*: but in our last Justification at Judgement we shall, *Mat.* 12. 36, 37. therefore they so far differ in the manner.

2. In our first Justification we were not justified *by our works*; but afterwards we are, in some sense, or else *James* spoke not by the Spirit of God, *Jam.* 2. 24. The Major is plain, in that the works of *Abraham*, *Rahab* and such like, that *James* speaks of, were not existent at their first Justification.

3. In

3. In our first Justification we are not Judged, (and so *Justified*) *according to our works*. But in the last we are: therefore they differ in the manner.

4. In our first Justification we are not justified by the mouth of the Judge, in presence passing a final irreversible sentence on us: but in the last we are: therefore they differ in the manner.

5. Our first pardon is not given us on condition of our first forgiving others: but the continuance is, *Matth.* 18. 35. & 6. 14, 15.

6. Our first pardon is not given us *if we confess our sins*: (For we may be pardoned without that): but the renewed or continued pardon is, if we be called to it, 1 *John* 1. 9.

7. Reconciliation and final Justification is given to us in title, *If we continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel*, &c. *Col.* 1.23.

8. In our first Believing we take Christ in the Relation of a Saviour, and Teacher, and Lord, to save us from all sin, and to lead us to glory. This therefore importeth that we accordingly submit unto him, in those his Relations, as a necessary means to the obtaining of the benefits of the Relations. Our first faith is our Contract with Christ, or Acceptance of him as our Saviour: And all contracts of such nature, do impose a necessity of performing what we consent to and promise, in order to the benefits. To take Christ for my Saviour, is to take him to save me, *viz.* from the power and guilt of sin; therefore if I will not be saved by him when I have done, but had rather keep my sin, then I did but nominally and hypocritically take him for my Saviour. To take him for my Teacher and become his Disciple, importeth my Learning of him, as necessary to the benefit.

And in humane contracts it is so. Barely to take a Prince for her husband may entitle a woman to his honours and lands: But conjugal fidelity is also necessary for the continuance of them: for Adultery would cause a divorce. Consent and listing may make a man your Souldier: but obedience and service is as necessary to the Continuance, and the Reward. Consent may make a man your servant, without any service, and so give

him entertainment in your family. But if he do not actually serve you, these shall not be continued, nor the wages obtained. Consent may enter a Scholar into your School: but if he will not Learn of you, he shall not be continued there. For all these after-violations cross the ends of the Relations. Consent may make you the subject of a Prince, but obedience is necessary to the continuance of your Priviledges. All Covenants usually tye men to somewhat which is to be performed to the full attainment of their ends. The Covenant-making may admit you, but its the Covenant-keeping that must continue you in your priviledges, and perfect them. See more in my *Confess.* pag. 47.

3. But I further answer you, that according to the sense of your party, of the terms [*faith and works*] I deny your consequence: For with them [*Faith*] is [*Works*]: And though in *Pauls* sense we are not at all justified by works; and in *Iames* his sense we are not at first justified by works: Yet in the sense of your party, we are justified by works even at first. For the Accepting of Christ for our King and Prophet, is *Works* with them: and this is *Pauls* faith, by which he and all are justified. Repentance is works with them: And this is one of Gods Conditions of our pardon. The Love and Desire of Christ our Saviour is works with them: but this is part of the faith that *Paul* was justified by. The like I may say of many acts of Assent, and other acts.

Treat. Lect. 24. p. 227. Argu. 4. *He that is justified by fulfilling a Condition, though he be thereunto enabled by grace, yet he is just and righteous in himself: But all justified persons, as to Iustification, are not righteous in themselves, but in Christ their Surety and Mediator.*

Answ. 1. If this were true in your unlimited latitude, Inherent Righteousness were the certainest evidence of damnation. For no man that had inherent Righteousness, *i. e.* Sanctification, could be justified or saved. But I am loth to believe that.

2. This Argument doth make as much against them that take *Faith*

Faith to be the Condition of Juſtification, and ſo look to be juſtified by it as a Condition, as againſt them that make Repentance or Obedience the Condition: And it concludeth them all excluders of the true and only Juſtification. I am loth to diſſent from you: but I am loather to believe that all thoſe are unjuſtified, that take faith for the Condition of Juſtification. They are hard Concluſions that your Arguments infer.

3. Righteouſneſs in a mans ſelf is either *Qualitative*, or *Relative*, called imputed. As to the later, I maintain that all the juſtified are Righteous in themſelves by an Imputed Relative Righteouſneſs, merited for them by Chriſt, and given to them. And this belief I will live and die in by the grace of God. Qualitative (and Active) Righteouſneſs is threefold. 1. That which anſwers the Law of works, [*Obey perfectly and live.*] 2. That which anſwers the bare letter of *Moſes* Law, (without Chriſt the ſenſe and end) which required an operous task of duty, with a multitude of ſacrifices for pardon of failings, (which were to be effectual only through Chriſt *whom* the unbelieving Jews underſtood not.) 3. That righteouſneſs which anſwers the Goſpel impoſition *Repent and Believe*. As to the firſt of theſe, A righteouſneſs fully anſwering the Law of nature. I yield your Minor, and deny your Major. A man may be juſtified by fulfilling the condition of the Goſpel which giveth us Chriſt to be our Righteouſneſs to anſwer the Law, and yet not have any ſuch righteouſneſs qualitative in himſelf, as ſhall anſwer that Law. Nay it neceſſarily implyeth that he hath none: For what need he to perform a Condition, for obtaining ſuch a Righteouſneſs by free gift from another, if he had it in himſelf. And as to the ſecond ſort of Righteouſneſs, I ſay, that it is but a nominal righteouſneſs, conſiſting in a conformity to the Letter without the ſenſe and end, and therefore can juſtifie none: beſides that none fully have it. So that the *Moſaical* Righteouſneſs, ſo far as is neceſſary to men, is to be had in Chriſt, and not in themſelves. But the performance by themſelves of the Goſpel Condition, is ſo far from hindring us from that gift, that without it none can have it. But then as to the third ſort of righteouſneſs qualitative, I anſwer, He that performeth the

Gospel Condition of Repenting and Believing himself, is not therefore Righteous in himself with that righteousnes qualitative which answereth the Law of works. But he that performeth the said Gospel Conditions, is Righteous in himself. 1. *Qualitatively* and *actively*, with that righteousnes which answers the Gospel Constitution, [*He that believeth shall be saved*, &c.] which is but a particular Righteousnes, by a Law of Grace, subordinated to the other as the Condition of a free gift. 2. And Relatively, by the Righteousnes answering the Law of Works, as freely given by Christ on that Condition. This is evident, obvious, necessary, irrefragable truth, and will be so after all opposition.

Treat. pag. 228. *Yea I think if it be well weighed, it will be found to be a contradiction, to say they are Conditions, and yet* a Causa sine qua non *of our Justification; for* a causa sine qua non, *is no Cause at all: but a Condition in a Covenant strictly taken, hath a Moral efficiency, and is* a Causa cum qua, *not* a sine qua non.

Answ. 1. You do but *think so*; and that's no cogent Argument. I think otherwise, and so you are answered. 2. And Lawyers think otherwise, (as is before shewed, and more might be) and so you are over-answered. A Condition *qua talis* (which is the *strictest* acception) is no Cause at all; though the matter of it may be meritorious, among men, and so causal. If you will not believe me, nor Lawyers, nor custom of speech, then remember at least what it is that I mean by a Condition; and make not the difference to lie where it doth not. Think not your self founder in matter of Doctrine, but only in the sense of the Word [*Condition*]; but yet do somewhat first to prove that too; *viz.* that a Condition as such, hath a moral efficiency. Prove that if you are able.

Treat. ib. *If* Adam *had stood in his integrity, though that confirmation would have been of grace, yet his works would have been a causall Condition of the blessednes promised. In the Covenant of Grace, though what man doth is by the gift of God, yet look upon the*

the same gift as our duty, and as a Condition, which in our persons is performed, This inferreth some Moral Efficiency.

Answ. 1. See then all you that are accounted Orthodox, the multitude of Protestant Divines that have made either Faith or Repentance Conditions, what a case you have brought your selves into. And rejoyce then all you that have against them maintained that the Covenant of Grace hath on our part no Conditions; for your Cause is better then some have made you believe: and in particular, this Reverend Author. Yea see what a case he hath argued himself into, while he hath argued you out of the danger that you were supposed in: For he himself writeth against those that make *Repentance to be but a sign, and deny it to be a Condition to qualifie the subject for Iust fixation. Treat. of Iustif. part.* 1. *Lect.* 20. And he saith that *in some gross sins there are many Conditions requisite (besides humiliation) without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained*: and instanceth in *restitution.* pag. 210. with many the like passages.

2. Either you mean that *Adams* Works would have been Causall *quatenus* a *Condition* performed, or else *quatenus meritorious ex natura materiæ*, or some other cause: The first I still deny, and is it that you should prove, and not go on with naked affirmations: The second I will not yield you, as to the notion of meritorious, though it be nothing to our question. The same I say of your later instance of Gospel Conditions. Prove them morally efficient, *qua tales*, if you can.

Treat. ib. *And so, though in* words *they deny, yet* in deed *they do exalt works to some kind of causality.*

Answ I am perswaded you speak not this out of malice: but is it not as unkind and unjust, as if I should perswade men, that you make God the Author of sin *indeed*, though you deny it in *words*? 1. What be the *Deeds* that you know my mind by to be contrary to my *Words*? Speak out, and tell the world, and spare me not. But if it be words that you set against words, 1. Why should you not believe my Negations, as well as my

(sup-

(ſuppoſed) affirmations. Am I credible only when I ſpeak amiſs, and not at all when I ſpeak right ? A charitable judgement! 2. And which ſhou'd you take to be *indeed* my ſenſe? A naked term [*Condition*] expounded by you that never ſaw my heart ? and therefore know not how I underſtand it, further then I tell you ; Or rather my *expreſs explication* of that term in a ſenſe contrary to your ſuppoſition. Hear all you that are impartial, and judge : I ſay [*A Condition is no Cauſe*] and [*Faith and Repentance are Conditions.*] My Reverend Brother tells you now, that in *word* I deny them to be efficient Cauſes, but *in deed* I make them ſuch, *viz.* I make them to be what I deny them to be. Judge between us, as you ſee cauſe. Suppoſe I ſay that [*Scripture is Sacred*] and withall I add that by *Sacred*, I mean that which is related to God, as proceeding from him, and ſeparated to him : and I plead Etymologie, and the Authority of Authors, and Cuſtom for my ſpeech. If my Reverend Brother now will contradict me only as to the fitneſs of the word, and ſay that *ſacer* ſignifieth only *execrabilis*, I will not be offended with him, though I will not believe him : but ſhould ſo good and wiſe a man proclaim in print, that *ſacer* ſignifieth only *execrabilis*, and therefore that though in *word* I call Scripture *Sacred*, yet in deed I make it *execrable*, I ſhould ſay this were unkind dealing. What ! plainly to ſay that a *Verbal* controverſie is a *Real* one ; and that contrary to my frequent publiſhed profeſſions ! What is this but to ſay, *Whatever he ſaith, I know his heart to be contrary.* Should a man deal ſo with your ſelf now, he hath ſomewhat to ſay for it : For you firſt profeſs *Repentance and Reſtitution to be a Condition* (as I do) and when you have done, profeſs *Conditions to have a Moral Efficiency* (which I deny) : But what's this to me, that am not of your mind ?

Treat. pag. 229. *A fifth Argument is that which ſo much ſounds in all Books. If good works be the effect and fruit of our Juſtification, then they cannot be Conditions*, or Cauſa ſine qua non *of our Juſtification. But*, &c.

Anſw. 1. I deny the Minor in the ſenſe of your party ; Our firſt

first Repentance, our first desire of Christ as our Saviour, and Love to him as a Saviour, and our first disclaiming of all other Saviours, and our first accepting him as Lord and Teacher, and as a Saviour from the Power of sin, as well as the guilt; all these are works with you; and yet all these are not the effects of our Relative Justification; nor any of them.

2. As to External acts and Consequent internal acts, I deny your Consequence, taking it of continued or final Justification; though I easily yield it as to our Justification at the first. 1. All the acts of justifying faith, besides the first act, are as truly effects of our first Justification as our other graces or gracious acts are. And doth it therefore follow that they can be no Conditions of our continued Justification? Why not Conditions as well as Instruments or Causes? Do you think that only the first instantaneous act of faith doth justifie, and no other after through the course of our lives? I prove the contrary from the instance of *Abraham*: It was not the first act of his faith that *Paul* mentioneth when he proveth from him Justification by faith. As its no good Consequence [*Faith afterward is the effect of Justification before; therefore it cannot afterward justifie, or be a Condition.*] So its no good Consequence as to Repentance, Hope, or Obedience. 2. It only follows that they cannot be the Condition of that Justification whereof they are the effect, and which went before them (which is granted you.) But it follows not that they may not be the Condition of continued or final Justification. Sucking the breast, did not cause life in the beginning: therefore it is not a means to continue it: It followeth not. You well teach that the Justification at the last Judgement is the chief and most eminent Justification. This hath more Conditions then your first pardon of sin had, yea as many as your salvation hath, as hath been formerly proved, and may be proved more at large.

Treat. pag. 230. *By this we may see that more things are required to our Salvation, then to our Justification; to be possessors of heaven, and (than it should be) to entitle us thereto.*

Answ. 1. Its true, as to our first Justifying: and its true as to our present continued state: because perseverance is still requisite to salvation. But its not true as to our final sentential Justification: There is as much on our part required to that, as to salvation it self. 1. The promise makes no difference. 2. The nature of the thing doth put it past doubt. For what is our final Justification, but a Determination of the Question by publick sentence, on our side, *Whether we have Right to salvation or not?* The 25. of *Matthew* shews the whole.

2. I argue against you from your own Doctrine here, thus; If Justification be it that gives us Right or Title to salvation, then that which is the Condition of our Right to salvation, is the Condition of our Justification: the Antecedent here is your own Doctrine, and is partly true: And the Consequence is undenyable; whereto I add, [But the Doing of Christs Commandments is the Condition of our Right to salvation: therefore also of our Right to Justification, *viz.* as Consummate. The Minor I prove, from *Rev.* 22. 14. *Blessed are they that do his Commandements, that they may have Right to the tree of life, and may enter in,* &c.] *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,* Rom. 10. 13. Acts 2, 21. *We are saved by hope,* Rom. 8. 24. *Who so walketh uprightly shall be saved,* Prov. 28. 18. *Baptism doth save us,* 1 Pet. 3. 21. [*In doing this thou shalt both save thy self and them that hear thee.*] 1 Tim. 4. 16. If he [*have not works, can faith save him?*] *Iames* 2. 14.

Treat. ib. *Its true, that Justification cannot be continued in a man, unless he continue in good works: Yet for all that, they are not Conditions of his Justification: they are Qualifications and Determinations of tht subject who is justified; but no Conditions of his Justification. As in the generation of man, &c. Light is necessarily required, and dryness, as qualties in fire, yet,* &c.

Answ. 1. Its well you once more confess that the thing is necessary! Our question then is only of the nature, and reason of that necessity? Whether it be *necessitas medii ad finem,* as to the

the continuance or consummation of our Justification? This I hope you will never deny. If *medii*, then what *medium* is it? not a cause. If not a condition, then tell us what, if you can.

Secondly, You say nothing to the purpose, when you give us Instances of *Natural* properties and qualifications. For besides that some of them are not *media* (as Light to burning) the rest that are *media*, are *Physically* necessary *ad finem*: But First, We are not discoursing of Physicks, and Physical necessities: but of Morals, and moral necessity. Secondly, You cannot here pretend (or at least prove) that there is an absolute Physical necessity *ad finem* to every one of the things in question to their end. Thirdly, Much less that this is the neareft reason of their Interest, and that God hath not morally superadded the necesity of a Condition by his Constitution.

I prove that the necessity is moral. First, It is imposed by way of Precept, which causeth a moral necessity. Secondly, The Precept hath varied at the pleasure of God, there being more Duties now, then formerly were, and some ceased that were then imposed.

Yea, That its a condition having necessity *ad finem*, is evident. First, Because it is the *modus promissionis* imposed on us by God as Promiser in a conditional form of words, as necessary to our attaining of the benefit promised. [*If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved*, Rom. 10.9. *If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you*, &c.] *Mat.* 64. 15. Secondly, And it is not of Physical necessity; for then God could not save us without it, but by a Miracle. Whereas he saved men before Christ by believing in a *Messiah* in general, without beliveing that this Jesus is he, and without believing that he was actually conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin *Mary*, was crucified, buried, rose again, ascended, *&c.* And he saveth Infants, that themselves believe not at all; so that when you say it is a *qualification of the subject*, you mean either [*the subject as justified*] and that is nothing to the business: for then the question is not what Re-

lation our actions have to that which is past, but to that which is future. Or else you mean *the subject as to be Justified at Judgement, or here to be so continued.* And then the question still remaineth, whether those qualifications are means or no means? *And if means, of what sort, if not conditions?*

Treat. *pag.* 231. *The sixth Argument: If Justification be by works as a condition, then one man is more or less Justified then another; and those works are required to one mans Justification which are not to another, so that there shall not be two godly men in the world Justified alike. For if faith Justified as a work, then he that had a stronger faith, would be more Justified then he that hath a weaker.*

Answer. First, I grant the conclusion, if you had taken Works in *Pauls* sense, for the works of a hirling, or any that are supposed to justifie by their value.

Secondly, I deny your first consequence: And I give you the reason of my denyal (I hope a little better then yours for the proof of it) First, It is not the *degree* of Repentance or Obedience that is made the Condition of our continued and final Justification: but the *Sincerity*. Now the sincerity is the same thing in one as in another; therefore one is no more justified hereby then another. Secondly, You might as well say, that different degrees of *faith*, make different degrees of Justification. But that is not just, because it lies all on the sincerity; therefore it is as unjust here for the same reason.

Your Reason is such as I expected not from you. [*For if Faith* (say you) *justifie as a work*] But who saith it doth *justifie as a work?* Your Reader that suspecteth nothing but fair in your words, may think I do; when I have again and again in *terminis* disavowed it. And do you think it is a cogent reason indeed, [*If works or faith justifie as a condition, there will be various degrees of Justification: Because if it justifie as a work, there will be various degrees.*] The reason of the Consequence is as strange to me, as *a baculo ad angulum.* Once more: First, Faith doth not justifie as a Physical act: Secondly, Nor as a Moral act, or virtue in general. Thirdly, Nor as a mercena-

ry

ry meritorious act. Fourthly, But as an act adapted to the object, and specially fitted to this gratious design, it is chosen to be the condition, and repentance and self-denyal accordingly to attend it. Fifthly, And as the appointed condition, we are justified by it. Sure therefore it doth not justifie as a work. But how they will avoid your consequence that say it justifieth as an Instrument, let them see.

As to your Consequence, I answer. First, That which is absolutely necessary, is sincere Repentance and sincere Obedience; and this is the same in all. Secondly, But the matter of both these, *viz.* the sins repented of, and the duties of Obedience may differ in many particulars in several persons. One may not have the same sins to Repent of as another, and one may have some particular duties more then another: though in the main, all have the same sin and duty. But this difference is no absurdity, nor strange thing. When Christ mentioneth the final Justification of some, *Mat.* 25. and gives the reason from their works [*for I was hungry and ye fed me*, &c.] I read of none that took it for an absurdity, because. First, The poor. Secondly, Infants. Thirdly, Those that dye before they have opportunity, do no such works.

Treat. *pag.* 231. *The seventh Argument. This Assertion according to the sense of the late Writers (that are otherwise Orthodox, for I mean not the* Socinians) *will bring in a Justification two Wayes, or make a twofold Justification, whereof one will be needless. For they grant an Imputation of Christs Righteousness in respect of the Law; he fulfilled that, and satisfied Gods Justice, that the Law cannot accuse us. And besides this, they make an Evangelical personal Righteousness by our own Evangelical works. Now certainly this later is wholly superfluous; for if Christs Righteousness be abundantly able to satisfie for all that righteousness which the Law requireth of us; What is the matter that it removeth not all our Evangelical failings, and supply that righteousness also? surely this is to make the Stars shine, When the Sun is in its full lustre. Thus it may be observed, While men for some seeming difficulty avoid the good known way of truth, they do commonly bring in Assertions of far more difficulty*

to be received. In this case its far more easie to maintain one single Righteousness, viz. *the Obedience of our Lord Christ, then to make two*, &c.

Answ. First, This twofold Righteousness is so far from being needless, that all shall perish in everlasting torment that have not both. I doubt not but you have both your self; and therefore do but argue with all this confidence against that which you must be saved by, and which you carry within you. As if you should argue that both a heart and a brain are needless, and therefore certainly you have but one. But the best is, concluding you have but one, doth not really prove that you have but one; for if it did, it would prove you had neither; and then you were but a dead man in one case, and a lost man in the other. First, Did ever any man deny the necessity of inherent Righteousness, that was called a Protestant? *Object.* But thats nothing to its necessity to Justification. *Answ.* First, Its the very being of it that you plead against as needless, if your words are intelligible. 2ly. Its as gross a contradiction to talk of a Righteousness that makes not righteous, or will not justifie *in tantum*, according to its proportion, as to talk of whitness that makes not white, or Paternity that makes not a father, or any form that doth not inform, or is a form, and is not a form.

Secondly, If there be two distinct Laws or Covenants, then there is a necessity of two dstinct Righteousnesses to our Justification. But the Antecedent is certain. I suppose it will be granted that Christs righteousness is necessary to answer the Law of works. And I shall further prove that a personal righteousness given from Christ, is necessary to fulfill the condition of the new Covenant or Law of Grace, *believe and be saved*, &c.

Thirdly, Christ did not himself *fulfill* the condition of the Gospel for any man, nor satisfie for his final non-performance; therefore he that will be saved, must perform it himself or perish. That Christ performed it not in person, is past doubt. It was not consistent with his state and perfection to repent of sin, who had none to repent of; to return from sin to God, who never fell from him; to beleve in Christ Jesus, that is, to accept himself as an offered Saviour, and to take himself as a Saviour

our to himself, that is, as one that redeemed himself from sin, to deny his own righteousness, to confess his sin, to pray for pardon of it, *&c.* Do you seriously believe that Christ hath done this for any man? For my part, I do not believe it. Secondly, That he that hath not satisfied for any mans final predominant Infidelity and Impenitency, I know you will grant, because you will deny that he dyed for any sin of that person (or at least, your party will deny it.) Thirdly, All that shall be saved, do actually perform these conditions themselves. I know you will confess it, that none (adult) but the Penitent, Believers, Holy, shall be saved. This sort of Righteousness therefore is of necessity.

Fourthly, The Benefits of Christs obedience and death are made over to men by a conditional Promise, Deed of gift, or act of oblivion. Therefore the condition of that Grant or Act must be found before any man can be justified by the righteousness of Christ. It is none of yours till you repent and believe: therefore you must have the personal Righteousness of faith and repentance, in subordination to the imputed righteousness, that it may be yours. And will you again conclude, that [*Certainly this later is wholly superfluous.*] Hath not God said?] *He that believeth, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned.*] And *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.* &c.] Is it not necessary that these be done then, both as duty commanded, and as a condition or some means of the end propounded and promised? And is this wholly superfluous? In Judgement, if you be accused to have been finally impenitent, or an Infidel, will you not plead your personal faith and repentance, to justifie you against that accusation? or shall any be saved that saith, [*I did not repent or believe, but Christ did for me?*] If it be said that [Christs *satisfaction is sufficient; but whats that to thee that performedst not the conditions of his Covenant, and therefore hast no part in it* ?] Will you not produce your faith and repentance for your Justification against this charge, and so to prove your Interest in Christ? Nay is it like to be the great business of that day to enquire whether Christ have done his part or no? or yet to enquire, whether the world were sinners? or rather to judge them according to the terms of grace which were revealed

to

to them, and to try whether they have part in Christ or not; and to that end, whether they believed, repented, loved him in his members, improved his Talents of Grace, or not? Or can any thing but the want of this personal righteousness then hazard a mans soul?

But you ask [*If Christs righteousness be able to satisfie, what is the matter that it removeth not all our Evangelical failings? &c.*] *Answ.* Either you ask this question as of a *penitent Believer*, or the finally *impenitent Unbeliever*. If of the former, I say, First, All his sins Christs righteousness pardoneth and covereth; and consequently all the failings in Gospel duties. Secondly, But his predominant final Impenitency and Infidelity Christ pardoneth not, because he is not guilty of it; he hath none such to pardon; but hath the personal righteousness of a performer of the conditions of the Gospel: And for the finally impenitent Infidels, the answer is, because they rejected that Righteousness which was able to satisfie, and would not return to God by him; and so not performing the condition of pardon, have neither the pardon of that sin, nor of any other which were conditionally pardoned to them.

If this Doctrine be the avoiding the good known way, there is a good known way besides that which is revealed in the Gospel: And if this be so hard a point for you to receive, I bless God, it is not so to me. And if it be far more easie to maintain one single righteousness, *viz.* imputed only; it will not prove so *safe* as *easie*. If one righteousness may serve, may not *Pilate* and *Simon Magus* be justified, if no man be put to prove his part in it? and if he be, how shall he prove it, but by his performance of the conditions of the Gift.

Treat. *pag.* 232. *Argu.* 8. *That cannot be a condition of Justification, which it self needeth Justification: But good works being imperfect, and having much dross cleaving, need a Justification to take that guilt away.*

Answ. First Again, hearken all you that have so long denyed the Covenant to have any conditions at all: Here is an Argument to maintain your cause: for it makes as much against faith

faith as any other acts (which they call works) for faith is imperfect also, and needs Justification, (a pardon I suppose you mean; I had rather talk of *pardoning* my sins, then *justifying* them, or any imperfections what ever.)

Secondly, But indeed its too gross a shift to help your cause. The Major is false, and hath nothing to tempt a man to believe it that I can see. Faith and Repentance are considerable. First, As sincere. Secondly, As imperfect: They are not the conditions of pardon as *imperfect*, but as *sincere*. God doth not say [*I will pardon you if you will not perfectly believe,*] but [*If you will believe.*] Imperfection is sin: and God makes not sin a condition of pardon and life. I am not able to conceive what it was that in your mind could seem a sufficiennt reason for this Proposition, that *nothing can be a condition that needs a pardon.* Its true, that in the same respect as it needs a pardon; that is, as it is a sin, it *can be no condition. But faith as faith, Repentance as Repentance is no sin.*

Treat. *ibid. Its true, Justification is properly of persons, and of actions indirectly and obliquely.*

Answ. The clean contrary is true, as of Justification in general, and as among men, ordinarily. The action is first accusable, or justifiable, and so the person as the cause of that Action. But in our Justification by Christs satisfaction, our Actions are not justifiable at all, save only that we have performed the condition of the Gift that makes his righteousnes ours.

Treat. *pag.* 233. *This question therefore is again and again to be propounded: If good works be the condition of our Justification, how comes the guilt in them that deserveth condemnation to be done away? Is there a further condition required to this condition? and so another to that with a* processus in infinitum?

Answ. Once may serve turn, for any thing regardable that I can perceive in it. But if so, again and again you shall be answered; The Gospel giveth Christ and life upon the same condition

to all; This condition is first a duty, and then a condition. As a duty we perform it imperfectly and so sinfully: for the perfection of it is a duty, but the perfection is not the condition, but the sincerity. Sincere Repentance and faith is the condition of the pardon of all our sins: therefore of their own Imperfections, which are sins. Will you ask now [*If faith be imperfect, how comes the guilt of that Imperfection to be pardoned? is it by a further condition, and so* in infinitum?] No: it is on tht same condition: sincere repentance and faith are the conditions of a pardon for their own Imperfections. Is there any difficulty in this, or is there any doubt of it? Why may not faith be a condition, as well as an Instrument of receiving the pardon of its own Imperfection? I hope still you perceive that you put these questions to others as well as me, and argue against the common Judgement of Protestants, who make that which is imperfect, to be the condition of pardon. [*Repent and be baptized* (saith *Peter*) *for the remission of sin*; Of what sin? is any excepted to the Penitent Believer? certainly no: It is of all sins. And is not the imperfection of faith and repentance a sin? The same we say of sincere obedience as to the continuance of our Justification, or the not losing it, and as to our final Justification. If we sincerely obey, God will adjudge us to salvation, and so justifie us by his final sentence, through the blood of Christ from all the imperfections of that obedience; what need therefore of running any further towards an *infinitum*?

Treat. *ibid. The Popish party and the Castellians are so far convinced of this, that therefore they say our good works are perfect. And* Castellio *makes that prayer for pardon not to belong to all the godly.*

Answ. It seems they are partly Quakers. But they are unhappy souls, if such an Argument could drive them to such an abominable opinion. And yet if this that you affirm, be the cause, that Papists have taken up the doctrine of perfection, I have more hopes of their recovery then I had before; nay, because they are some of them men of ordinary capacities, I take it as if it were done already. For the Remedy is most obvious;

vious; Understand, Papists, that it is Faith and Repentance and Obedience to Christ in Truth, and not in Perfection that is the Condition of your final Justification at Judgement, and you need not plead for perfection any more. But I hardly believe you, that this is the cause of their error in this point.

And you may see that if Protestants had no more Wit then Papists, they must all be driven by the violence of your Argument, to hold that Faith and Repentance are perfect.

And seeing you tell us of *Castellio's* absurdity, I would intreat you to tell us, why it is that you pray for pardon your selves; either you take *Prayer* to be *Means* to obtain pardon, or you do not: If not, then 1. Pardon is *none* of your end in praying for pardon. 2. And then if once it be taken for no means, men cannot be blamed if they use it but accordingly. But if you do use it as a means, then what means is it? Is Prayer any cause of Pardon? say so, and you say more then we that you condemn, and fall under all those censures that *per fas aut nefas* are cast upon us. If it be no cause of pardon; Is it a condition *sine qua non*, as to that manner of pardoning that your prayer doth intend? If you say yea, you consequentially recant your disputation (or Lecture) and turn into the tents of the Opinionists. But if it be no condition of pardon, then tell us what means it is if you can. If you say, it is a duty. I answer, Duty and Means are commonly distinguished, and so is *necessitas præcepti & medii*. Duty as such, is no means to an end, but the bare result of a command. Though all Duty that God commandeth is also some means, yet that is not *qua* Duty. And so far as that Duty is a means, it is either a *Cause*, (near or remote) or a *Condition*, either of the obtainment of the benefit, simply, or of the more certain, or speedy, or easie attainment of it, or of obtaining some inferiour good, that conduceth to the main. So that still it is a Cause or a Condition, if a means. If you say, It is an *Antecedent*. I say, *qua tale*, that is no means. but if a *Necessary* antecedent, that which is the reason of its necessity may make it a means. If you go to Physical prerequisites (as you talkt of a mans shoulders bear-

ing the head that he may see, *&c.*) you go *extra oleas*; Its a moral means that we treat of, and I think you will not affirm Prayer to be a means of physical necessity to pardon. If it were, it must be a Physical cause, near or remote, or a *Dispositio materiæ* of natural necessity, *&c.* If you say, that prayer for pardon, is *dispositio subjecti*, I answer, thats it that we Opinionists do affirm: But it is a *dispositio moralis*, and necessary *ut medium ad finem*: and that necessity must be constituted by the Promiser or Donor: and that can be only by his *modus promissionis*, which makes it in some measure or other a condition of the thing promised. So that there is no lower moral *medium* then a meer condition *sine qua non*, that my understanding can hitherto find out, or apprehend.

Treat. *ibid.* Paul *Judgeth them dung and dross in reference to Justification; yea all things*, &c.

Answ. 1. But what are those *All things*? 2. And what *Reference* to Justification is it? If *All things* simply in all relation to Justification, then he must judge the *Gospel* dung and dross as to the Instrumental collation of Justification; and the Sacraments dung and dross as to the sealing of it; and the Ministry dung and dross, as to the preaching and offering it, and beseeching men to be reconciled to God: and Faith to be dung and dross, as to the receiving of it; as well as Repentance and Faith to be dung and dross as conditions of it; or Prayer, Obedience, as conditions of continuing it.

2. Its evident in the text that *Pauls* speaks of *All things* that stand in opposition to Christ, and that stand in competition with him, as such; and not of any thing that stands in a necessary subordination to him as such.

3. He expresly addeth in the text, [*for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord*] this therefore is none of the [*all things* that are *dung*] for the *All things* are opposed to this. And it containeth that faith, which is *works* with the Opponents: for this is more then a recumbency on Christ as Priest: It is the *Knowledge* of him as *Lord* also. I am confident I shall never learn to expound *Paul* thus [*I esteem All things*,

things, even the knowledge of Christ Jesus as Lord and Prophet, as dung for the Knowledge of him as Priest.] Also *Paul* here excepteth his *suffering the loss of that All.* I am confident that the [*All*] that *Paul* suffered the loss of, comprehended not his Self-denyal, Repentance, Prayer, Charity, Hope, *&c.*

4. It is not only in *reference* to *Justification* that *Paul* despiseth *All things*; but it is to the *winning* of Christ (who doubtless is the Principle of Sanctification as well as Justification) and to be *found in him*, which containeth the sum of his felicity. If a man should be such a self-contradicter as to set Repentance, or Faith in Christ, or Prayer in his Name, or Hope in him, *&c.* against winning Christ, and against being found in him, or against the knowledge of him, let that man so far esteem his faith, hope, prayer, *&c.* as dung. If you should say, [*I account all things dung for the winning of God himself as my felicity.*] Would you have me interpret you thus, [*I account the love of God dung, and prayer to him, and studious obeying him, and the word that revealeth him,* &c. *even as they stand subordinate to him.*] This same *Paul* rejoyced in the testimony of his conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity he had had his conversation among them: and he beat or subdued his body, and brought it into subjection, lest he should be Reprobated after he was justified, and he prayed for pardon of sin, and tells *Timothy*, [*In doing this thou shalt save thy self,* &c.] therefore these things thus used, were none of the *All things*, that he opposed to the knowledge of Christ, as dung.

Treat. pag. 234, 235. *Others would avoid this Objection, by saying, that Gospel graces, which are the Conditions of the Covenant, are reducible to the Law, and so Christ in satisfying the Law, doth remove the imperfections cleaving to them: And they judge it absurd to say, that Christ hath satisfied for the sins of the second Covenant, or breaches, which is said to be only final unbelief.*

Answ. As this is brought in by head and shoulders, so is it recited lamely, without the necessary distinctions and explicati-

ons adjoyned, yea without part of the Sentence it self: and therefore unfaithfully.

Treat. *But this answer may be called Legion; for many errours and contradictions are in it.* 1. *How can justifying faith* qua talis *in the act of Justifying, and Repentance, be reducible duties to the Law taken strictly? Indeed as it was in a large sense discovered to the Jews, being the Covenant of Grace, as I have elsewhere proved* (Vindic. Legis) *so it required Justifying Faith and Repentance. But take it in the sense as the* Abettor *of this opinion must do, justifying faith and repentance must be called the works of the Law.*

Answ. Its easilier called *Legion* then faithfully reported, or solidly confuted. 1. Let the Reader observe how much I incurr'd the displeasure of Mr. *Blake*, for denying the Moral Law to be the sufficient or sole Rule of all duty, and how much he hath said against me therein; and then judge how hard a task it is to please all men: when these two neighbours and friends, do publikely thus draw me such contrary waies, and I must be guilty of more then ordinary errour whether I say *Yea* or *Nay*. And yet (which is the wonder) they differ not among themselves.

2. But seeing your ends direct you to fetch in this controversie, so impertinent to the rest, its requisite that the Abettor do better open his opinion, then you have done, that the Reader may not have a Defence of he knows not what.

My opinion so oft already explained in other writings, is this.

1. That the Law of Nature as continued by the Mediator, is to be distinguished from the Remedying Law of Grace, called the New Testament, the Promise, *&c.* (Whether you will call them two Laws, or two parts of one Law, is little to the purpose, seeing in some respect they are two, and in some but one.)

2. That this continued Law of Nature hath its Precept and Sanction, or doth constitute the Dueness, 1. Of Obedience in general to all that God hath commanded or shall command.

2. And

2. And of many duties in particular. 3. And of everlasting death as the penalty of all sin. So that it saith, *The wages of sin is death.*

3. That to this is affixed the Remedying Law of Grace, like an act of Oblivion, which doth 1. Reveal certain points to be believed. 2. And command the belief of them, with other particular duties in order to its ends. 3. And doth offer Christ, and Pardon, and Life, by a Conditional Donation enacting that whosoever will Repent and Believe shall be Justified, and persevering therein with true obedience, shall be finally adjudged to everlasting life, and possessed thereof. Its tenor is, He that Repenteth and Believeth shall be saved, and he that doth not shall be damned.

4. That the sense of this Promise and Threatning is, *He that Repenteth and Believeth at all in this life, though but at the last hour, shall be saved; and he that doth it not at all shall be damned.* Or *he that is found a penitent Believer at death*, &c. And not, he that believeth not to day or to morrow shall be damned, though afterward he do.

5. That the threatning of the Law of Nature was not at first Peremptory and Remediless; and that now it is so far Remedyed, as that there is a Remedy at hand for the dissolving of the Obligation, which will be effectual as soon as the Condition is performed.

6. That the Remedying Law of Grace, hath a peculiar penalty, that is, 1. Non-liberation, A privation of Pardon and life which was offered (For that's now a penal privation, which if there had been no Saviour, or Promise, or Offer, would have been but a Negation.) 2. The certain Remedilessness of their misery for the future, that there shall be no more sacrifice for sin. 3. And whether also a greater degree of punishment, I leave to consideration.

7. I still distinguished between the Precepts and the Sanction of the Law of Grace or New Covenant, and between sin as it respecteth both: And so I said, that Repentance and Faith in Christ (even as a means to Justification) are commanded *in specie* in the Gospel, which constituteth them duties, but commanded consequently *in genere* in the Law of nature under the general

neral of Obedience to all particular precepts : and whether also the Law of Nature require the duty *in ſpecie*, ſuppoſing God to have made his ſupernatural preparations in providing and propounding the objects, I left to enquiry. Accordingly I affirmed that Impenitency and Infidelity, though afterward Repented of, as alſo the Imperfections of true faith and repentance, are ſins againſt the General precept of the Law of Nature, and the ſpecial precept of the Law of Grace, and that Chriſt dyed for them, and they are pardoned through his blood, upon condition of ſincere Repentance and Faith.

8. Accordingly diſtinguiſhing between the reſpect that ſin hath to the precept and prohibition on one ſide, and to the promiſe and threatning on the other, I affirmed, that the foreſaid Impenitency and Infidelity that are afterwards repented of, and the Imperfections of true Faith and Repentance are condemned by the Remediable threatning of the Law of Nature only, and that the perſon is not under the Actual obligation of the peculiar Threatning of the Law of Grace; that is, that though as to the Goſpel *Precept*, theſe ſins may be againſt the Goſpel as well as the Law, yet as to the *Threatning*, they are not ſuch violations of the New Covenant, as bring men under its actual curſe; for then they were remedileſs. And therefore I ſaid, that its only final Impenitency and Unbelief, as final, that ſo ſubjects men to that Curſe or Remedileſs peremptory ſentence. The reaſon is, becauſe the Goſpel maketh Repenting and Believing at any time before death, the Condition of promiſed pardon: and therefore if God by death make not the contrary impenitency and unbelief final, it is not that which brings a man under the Remedileſs Curſe; (except only in caſe of the Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which is ever final.)

9. Accordingly I affirm that Chriſt never bore, or intended to bear the peculiar Curſe of his own Law of Grace. 1. As not ſuffering for any mans final impenitency and unbelief, which is proved in his Goſpel conſtitution, which giveth out pardon only on Condition of Faith and Repentance: and therefore the non-performance of his Condition is expreſly excepted from all pardon, and conſequently from the intended ſatisfaction, and price of pardon. 2. In that he did not bear that *ſpecies* of puniſhment,

puniſhment, as peculiarly appointed by the Goſpel, *viz.* To be denyed Pardon, Juſtification and Adoption, and to be Remedileſs in miſery, *&c.*

10. Alſo I ſaid, that all other ſins are pardonable on the Goſpel Conditions; but the non-performance (that is, final) of thoſe Conditions is everlaſtingly unpardonable (and conſequently no ſin pardoned for want of them.)

Reader, this is the face of that Doctrine which Reverend Brethren vail over with the darkneſs and confuſion of theſe General words; that I ſay, [*Chriſt hath not ſatisfied for ſins againſt the ſecond Covenant.*] And all theſe explications I am fain to trouble the world with, as oft as they are pleaſed to charge me in that confuſion. But what remedy? This is the Legion of errours and contradictions; which I leave to thy impartial judgement, to abhor them as far as the Word and Spirit ſhall convince thee that they are erroneous, and to bleſs thoſe Congregations and Countries that are taught to abhor them, and to rejoyce in their felicity that believe the contrary.

Treat. pag. 235. 2. *If ſo, then the Works of the Law are Conditions of our Juſtification, and thus he runneth into the extream he would avoid.*

Anſw. 1. The works which the Law requireth to Juſtification, that is, perfect obedience, are not the Conditions of Juſtification. 2. Nor the fulfilling of the *Moſaical* Law of Sacrifices, *&c.* 3. But from among duties in general required by the Moral Law, after the ſpecial Conſtitution of the Goſpel, God hath choſen ſome to be the Conditions of life. And if you believe not this, I refer you to Mr. *Blake*, who will undertake to prove more.

2. But your aſſertion is groundleſs. I ſaid not that they are works of the Law. What if the Law condemn the neglect of a Goſpel duty? Do I call the duty, a work of the Law, becauſe I ſay the Law condemneth the neglecters of it?

3. But are you indeed of the contrary opinion, and againſt that which you diſpute againſt? Do you think that the Law doth not threaten unbelievers, when the Goſpel hath com-

manded faith? Have I so much ado to perswade the men of your party, that the Gospel hath any peculiar threatning or penalty, and that it is truly a Law (which the *Lutherans* have taught too many) and now do you think that its only the Gospel that Curseth impenitent unelievers, and that maketh punishment due for the remnant of these sins in penitent Believers? Let the Reader judge who runneth into extreams and self-contradiction.

Treat. ib. *But above all, that is not to be endured, that Christ hath not suffered for the breaches of the New Covenant, and that there is no such breach but final impenitency: For are the defects of our Repentance, faith and love in Christ, other then the partial breaches of the Covenant of Grace? our unthankfulness, unfruitfulness, yea sometimes with* Peter, *our grievous revolts and apostacies; What are these but the sad shakings of our Covenant-interest, though they do not dissolve it? But it is not my purpose to fall on this, because of its impertinency to my matter in hand.*

Answ. I rather thought it your purpose to fall upon it, though you confess it impertinent to your matter in hand. For I thought you had *purposed* before you had *Printed* or *Preached.*

Reader, I suppose thee one that hath no pleasure in darkness, and therefore wouldst see this intolerable errour barefaced. To which end, besides what is said before, understand, 1. That I use to distinguish between a threefold breach of the Covenant. 1. A sin against a meer *precept* of the Gospel, which precept may be Synecdochically called the Covenant. 2. A sin against our *own Promise* to God when we Covenant with him. 3. A violation of Gods constitution, [*Believe and be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*] making us the proper subjects of its Actual Curse or Obligation to its peculiar punishment. 2. On these distinctions I use to say as followeth; 1. That Christ suffered for our breaches of Gospel precepts. 2. And for our breaches of many promises of our own to God. 3. And for our temporary non-performance of the Gospel Conditions, which left us under a non-liberation for that time,

(and

(and therefore we had no freedom from so much as was executed.) 4. But not for such violation of the New Covenant, or Law of Grace, as makes us the actual subjects of its Curse or Obligation to Remedilesse punishment. These are my usual limitations and explications. And do I need to say any more now in defence of this opinion, which my Reverend Brother saith is not to be endured ? 1. Is it a clear and profitable way of teaching to confound all these, under the general name of Covenant-breaking ? 2. Or is it a comfortable Doctrine, and like to make Congregations blessed, that our defects of repentance, unfruitfulness, and unthankfulness, *&c.* are such violations of the Law of Grace, or the Conditions of the Gospel, as bring us under its actual obligation to Remedilesse punishment ? That is, in plain English, to say, We shall all be damned.

Treat. ib. Argument 9. *If Works be a condition of our Justification, then must the godly soul be filled with perpetual doubts, and troubles, whether it be a person justified or no. This doth not follow accidentally through mans perverseness from the fore-named Doctrine: but the very* Genius *of it tends thereunto. For if a Condition be not performed, then the mercy Covenanted cannot be claimed: As in faith; if a man do not believe, he cannot say, Christ with his benefits are his. Thus if he have not works, the Condition is not performed, but still he continueth without this benefit. But for Works; How shall I know when I have the full number of them ? Whether is the Condition of the* species *or* individuums *of works ? Is not one kind of work omitted when its my duty, enough to invalidate my Justification ? Will it not be as dangerous to omit that one as all, seeing that one is required as a Condition ?*

Answ. Your Argument is an unproved Assertion, not having any thing to make it probable. 1. Belief in Christ as Lord and Teacher, is *Works* with the Opponents. Why may not a man know when he believeth in Christ as King and Prophet, and is his Disciple, as well as when he believeth in him as Priest ?

2. Repentance is *Works* also with the Opponents. Why may not a man know when he Repenteth, as well as when he believeth.

3. Do you not give up the Proteſtant cauſe here to the Papiſts in the point of certainty of ſalvation ? We tell them that we may be certain that our faith is ſincere. And how ? why by its fruits and concomitants, and that we take Chriſt for Lord as well as Saviour, or to ſave us from the power of ſin as well as the guilt ? And is it now come to that paſs that theſe cannot be known ? What not the ſigns by which faith it ſelf ſhould be known, and therefore ſhould be *notiora ?* This it is to eye man, and to be ſet upon the making good of an opinion.

4. Let all Proteſtants anſwer you, and I have anſwered you. *How will they know when they Repent and Believe, when they have performed the full of theſe ? believed all neceſſary Truths ? Repented of all ſins that muſt be Repented of ? Whether it be the* ſpecies *or individual acts of theſe that are neceſſary ! Will not the omiſſion of Repentance for one ſin invalidate it ? Or the omiſſion of many individual acts of faith ? are not thoſe acts conditions ?* &c. Anſwer theſe, and you are anſwered.

5. But I ſhall anſwer you briefly for them and me. Its no impoſſible thing to know when a man ſincerely believeth, repenteth and obeyeth, though many Articles are Eſſential to the Aſſenting part of faith, and many ſins muſt be Repented of, and many duties muſt be done. God hath made known to us the Eſſentials of each. It is not the Degree of any of them, but the Truth that is the Condition. A man that hath imperfect Repentance, Faith and Obedience, may know when they are ſincere, notwithſtanding the imperfections. Do you not believe this ? Will you not maintain it againſt a Papiſt when you are returned to your former temper ? what need any more then to be ſaid of it ?

6. Your Argument makes as much againſt the making uſe of theſe by way of bare ſigns, as by way of Conditions. For an unknown ſign is no ſign to us.

7. And how could you over-look it, that your Argument flyeth too boldly in the face of Chriſt, and many a plain Text of Scripture ? Chriſt ſaith, John 15. 10. *If ye keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my love, even as I have kept*, &c. 14. *Ye are my friends, if ye do whatſoever I command you*, Mat. 7. 21.

7. 21. *Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven.* 23, 24. *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them*, &c. Mat. 5. throughout. verse 20. *Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of heaven.* 1 John 3. 10. *In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil: whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.*] An hundred such passages might be cited. And will you meet all these with your objections, and say, [*How shall I know when I have the full number?* &c.] Know that you have *sincere* Faith, Repentance and Obedience, and you may know you perform that Condition of the Gospel: else not.

Treat. pag. 236. *That if good works be a Condition of Justification, then none are justified till their death; because in every good work is required perseverance, in so much that perseverance is that to which the promise is made*, Mat. 24. 6. Heb. 10. 38. Rev. 2. 7, 20. *So that it is not good works simply, but persevered in that is required: and therefore no Justification to the end of our daies, so that we cannot have any peace with God till then. Neither doth it avail to say, Justification is not compleat till then; for it cannot be at all till then, because the Condition that gives life to all is not till then.*

Answ. 1. And is not perseverance in faith as necessary as perseverance in obedience? Read *Col.* 1. 23. *John* 15. 2, 3, *&c.* and many the like, and judge. Will you thence infer that none are justified till death?

2. But a little step out of the darkness of your Confusion, will bring the fallacy of your Argument to the light, and there will need no more to it. The Gospel conveyeth to us several benefits: some without any Condition, and several benefits on several Conditions. 1. Our first Actual pardon and Justification, and right to life, is given on Condition of our first Faith and Repentance: and not on Condition of External works of Obedience, nor yet of persevering in faith it self, much less in that

Obedience. 2. Our ſtate of Juſtification is continued on condition of the continuance of Faith and Repentance, with ſincere Obedience. 3. Our particular following ſins have a particular pardon, on Condition of the Continuance of the habits and renewing of the acts of that faith and repentance, for known obſerved ſins. 4. Our full Juſtification by Sentence at Judgement, is on the ſame condition as Glorification, *viz.* On perſeverance in Faith, Repentance, Hope, Love and ſincere Obedience.

Prove now if you can that perſeverance is the Condition of our firſt pardon. Prove if you can that final perſeverance is the Condition of our continuance in a juſtified ſtate till now. You ſay, Juſtification and peace cannot be ours till the condition be performed. But what condition? of that gift? or of another gift? If of that, its granted: but its ſtill denyed that perſeverance is any of the Condition of our firſt pardon? If of another gift; its no reaſon of your Conſequence. If you ſpeak of final Juſtification and Salvation, I grant you all thus far, that you have no full Right of poſſeſſing them but on perſeverance; nor no Right at all, or certainty of Salvation, but on ſuppoſition of perſeverance as neceſſary to the poſſeſſion. And therefore if you can prove that we have no certainty of perſeverance, I will yield that we have no certainty of ſalvation.

Treat. *Thus we have aſſerted this truth by many Arguments; and though any one ſingly by it ſelf may not convince, yet altogether may ſatisfie —— Now to the great Objections ——*

Anſw. I heartily wiſh that wiſer Readers may find more truth and ſatisfaction in them then I can do, if it be there to be found; and to that end that they make their beſt of them all.

Treat. James *ſaith*, Abraham *was juſtified by Works —— ſo that in outward appearances theſe two great Apoſtles ſpeak contradictions, which hath made ſome deny the Canonical authority of* James's *Epiſtle. Yea one ſaid blaſphemouſly*, Althameirius, Mentiris Jacobe in caput tuum. *But this is to cut, not untie the knot.* ——

1. *The*

1. *The scope of the Apostle* Paul *is to treat upon our Justification before God, and what is the Instrument and means of obtaining it.—— But the Apostle* James *takes Justification for the Declaration and Manifestation of it before men.——*

Answ. This is not the only sense of *James* (as I have proved before, to which I refer you) no nor any part of the sense of the word *Justification* with him, though he mention *shewing faith by works to men*, as an argument for his main conclusion, yet he nowhere expoundeth the word Justification by it. *James* expresly speaks of Imputation of Righteousnes by God, and of that Justification which is meant in the words of *Gen.* concerning *Abraham*, even the same words that *Paul* expoundeth; and of that Justification which inferreth salvation.

Treat. Paul *informeth us that faith only justifieth, and* James, *what kind of faith it is, even a lively working faith.*

Answ. I have answered this in the beginning of this Disputation.

Treat. *Its said, They dare not go against the plain words of the Apostle. But its not the* τὸ ῥητὸν *but* διάνοια, *not the words, but the sense——*

Answ. Our Question is, How the sense of *James* shall be known? Will you say, not by the words, but by the sense? The words are to expres the sense; and we must take heed of forcing them as much as we can. As to your saying of the Anthropomorphites, and *Hoc est corpus meum*; I answer; the Tropical sense is oft the plaineſt; and in particular in these instances. If any man point to several pictures, and say, This is *Cæsar*, and this is *Pompey*, &c. I shall by use of speech (the interpreter of words) take the tropical sense to be the plaineſt, and not the literal; *viz.* That this is *Cæsars* Image, and not that it is his person. And so here.

2. Give me any cogent Evidence that I must leave the plain sense, and I am satisfied.

3. Remember

3. Remember I pray you, that its not the words, but the ſenſe that you except againſt. Do not you except hereafter againſt the ſaying that (we are Juſtified by works, and not by faith only] as *James* doth; but againſt the ill ſenſe that you can prove to be put upon the words.

Treat. *pag.* 238. *Laſtly, They are forced to add to the Apoſtle; for they ſay, Works juſtifie as the Condition of the Goſpel, which the Apoſtle doth not ſpeak a Word of.*

Anſw. 1. We ſay not that *James* calls them a condition; therefore we add not to him as his.

2. Every Expoſition and application is an addition of another ſort, but not as of the ſame.

3. I uſe not the active phraſe that *Works juſtifie*, agreeing ſo far with you, who note a difference between theſe ſayings, *Faith juſtifieth*, and *we are juſtified by faith*: for all that Mr. *Blake* deſpiſeth the obſervation, which perhaps he would ſcarce have done, if he had known that you had being guilty of it alſo.

4. Scripture ſuppoſeth Grammer, Logick, Phyſicks, *&c.* and no more is to be expected from it but its own part. If *James* tell you that we are juſtified by works, he doth not ſay that δικαιῶται is a verb, and ἔργων is a noun, and ſo of the reſt; but he warranteth you to ſay ſo without any unjuſt addition ſuppoſing that Grammer ſo call them; If the Scripture ſay, that *God created the Heavens and the earth*, it doth not ſay here in terms, that God was the efficient cauſe: but it warranteth you to ſay ſo: If it ſay, that Chriſt dyed for us, and was a Sacrifice for our ſins, and hath obtained eternal redemption for us; yet it ſaith not that he is the meritorious cauſe, or the material cauſe of our Juſtification: But it will warrant you to ſay ſo, without the guilt of unjuſt additions. If you may ſay as a Grammarian and a Logitian, when you meet with ſuch words in Scripture, [Theſe are Paronyma, and theſe Synonyma, and theſe Homonyma, and this is an univerſal, that a ſingular, that a particular, and that an indefinite; this is an efficient cauſe, that a material, formal or final; this is a noun, that a verb, the other a participle

participle or an adverb; I pray you then why may not I say, when I read in *Rom.* 10.9. that [*If thou confess with thy mouth, and believe in thy heart*, &c.] that [*If*] is a conjunction conditional? Is this adding to the Scripture unjustly? If I did, when ever I read that we are justified *by* faith, collect thence that faith is an Instrumental cause, as if *by* were only the note of an Instrument, then you might have accused me of unwarrantable addition, or collections, indeed.

Lastly, If you have a mind to it, I am content that you lay by the unscriptural names (or additions as you speak) of nouns, pronouns, verbs, antecedents, consequents, efficient, or material causes *&c.* and I will lay by the name of a condition, as you do of an Instrument: and we will only use the Scripture phrase, which is, *If you forgive men, your Father will forgive you; if we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive: we are justified by faith without the works of the Law: A man is justified by works and not by faith only: By thy Words thou shalt be justified. Every man shall be judged according to his works,*] &c. Let us keep to Scripture phrase if you desire it, and you shall find me as backward as any to lay much stress upon terms of Art.

Having gone thus far, I shall in brief give you a truer reconciliation of *Paul* and *James* then you here offer us. 1. They debate different questions. 2. And that with different sorts of persons. 3. And speak directly of different sorts of works. 4. And somewhat differ in the sense of the word Faith. 5. And somwhat about the word Justification. 6. And they speak of works in several Relations to Justification.

1. The Question that *Paul* disputed was principally Whether Justification be by the works of the *Mosaical* Law, and consequently by any mercenary works, without Christ, or in Co-ordination with Christ, or any way at all conjunct with Christ? The question that *James* disputed, was, Whether men are justified by meer believing without Gospel-Obedience?

2. The persons that *Paul* disputed against, were, 1 The unbelieving *Jews*, that thought the *Mosaical* Law was of

such perfection to the making of men righteous, that there needed no other, much less should it be abrogate. Where specially note, that the righteousness which the *Jews* expected by that Law, was not (as is commonly imagined) a righteousness of sinless obedience, such as was required of *Adam*; but a mixt Righteousness, consisting of accurate Obedience to the *Mosaical* Law in the main course of their lives, and exact sacrificing according to that Law for the pardon of their sins committed, (wherein they made express confession of sin) so that these two they thought sufficient to justifie, and lookt for the *Messias* but to free them from captivity, and repair their Temple, Law, &c. And 2. *Paul* disputed against false Teachers, that would have joyned these two together (the Righteousness of *Moses* Law, and Faith in Christ) as necessary to life.

But *James* disputed against false Christians, that thought it enough to salvation barely to believe in Christ, (or lived as if they so thought) its like misunderstanding *Pauls* Doctrine of Justification as many now do.

3. The works that *Paul* speaks of directly, are the services appointed by *Moses* Law supposed to be sufficient, because of the supposed sufficiency of that Law. So that its all one with him to be justified by the Law, and to be justified by works; and therefore he ofter speaks against Justification by the Law expresly, and usually stileth the works he speaks of, the works of the Law: yet by consequence, and a parity of Reason, he may well be said to speak against any works imaginable that are set in opposition to Christ, or competition with him, and that are supposed meritorious, and intended as Mercenary.

But *James* speaks of no works, but Obedience to God in Christ, and that as standing in due subordination to Christ.

4. By *Faith* in the Doctrine of Justification, *Paul* means our Assent to all the essential Articles of the Gospel, together with our Acceptance of Jesus Christ the Lord, as such, and affiance in him; that is, To be a Believer; and so to have faith, is with *Paul*, to be a Disciple of Christ, or a Christian: Though sometime he specially denominates that faith from one part of the

the object (the promise) sometime from another (the blood of Christ) sometime from a third (his obedience.) And in other cases he distinguisheth Faith from Hope and Charity: but not in the business of Justification, considering them as respecting Christ and the ends of his blood.

But *James* by faith means a bare ineffectual Assent to the Truth of the Christian Religion, such as the Devils themselves had.

5. *Paul* speaks of Justification in its whole state, as begun and continued. But *James* doth principally, if not only speak of Justification as continued. Though if by works any understand a disposition to work in faith, or conjunct with it (as Dr. *Jackson* doth) so his words are true of initial Justification also.

6. The principal difference lyeth in the Relations of works mentioned. *Paul* speaks of works as the immediate matter of a legal personal Righteousness, in part or whole. But *James* spoak of Works, not as answering the Law, but as fulfilling the condition of the Gospel, and implyed (as promised or resolved on) in our first believing, and so as subservient to the Sacrifice, Merit and Righteousness of Christ, as the avoiding of poison or dangerous meats (that may kill, though the contrary cannot cure) is subservient to the curing medicine of a Physician, and implyed in our taking him for our Physician at first.

And so much briefly to satisfie you and the world, of the Reasons of my Dissent from you, that I may not differ from so Dear and Reverend a Brother, without making it appear, that necessity did compel me.

That which I have passed over, being about the Instrumentality of Faith, I shall speak to, (if God will) together with Mr. *Blakes* Reasonings on that Subject, in another Disputation.

Oppon. Works are not a Condition, much leſs a Cauſe of our Juſtification, under any Notion whatſoever they are taken: *i. e.* Neither Faith in Chriſt as Lord and Teacher, becoming his Diſciples, Repentance, Love, Hope, Prayer for Pardon, Confeſſion, Self-denyal, ſincere Obedience, *&c.* are Cauſes or Conditions of Juſtification, as begun, continued, or as it is moſt eminent in the ſentence at Judgement.

Conſ. *Erg.* This Faith, Repentance, Prayer, Obedience, *&c.* are not truly means of our Juſtification now or at Judgement.

Ergo. Not means to the pardon of ſin, and freedom from puniſhment.

Ergo. Not means of Salvation from Hell, or of that Glory to which the final Juſtification will adjudge us.

Ergo. 1. They are not neceſſary *neceſſitate medii*, and 2. No Man muſt uſe them as means to his preſent pardon, or Juſtification, or final Juſtification or ſalvation.

Ergo. No means muſt be uſed for preſent or final Juſtification or Salvation, but only the Inſtrumental receiving or apprehending of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, or of Chriſt as Prieſt. *Ergo.*———

Object. There are means beſides Cauſes and Conditions. *Anſw.* Beſides *Cauſas & Conditiones proximas*, there are: but beſides *Cauſas & Conditiones & proximas & remotas*, in this caſe there are none that I know of: if there be, name them.

Letters

LETTERS

That past between

This

REVEREND,

Much

HONOURED

BROTHER,

And my SELF. 1649, and 1650.

LONDON,

Printed by *Robert White*, for *Nevil Simmons*, Book-seller in *Kederminster*.

Having heard that Mr. ——— *disliked some things in my Aphorisms, and by the perswasions of some, intended a Confutation of them: I wrote to him an earnest Request, that he would acquaint me with what he disliked, annexing his Reasons to convince me of my Errors, professing my earnest Desire of Information, especially from him: To which he replyed, as followeth:*

Dear

Dear Sir.

I Have indeed declared to ſome, who happily may have informed you of it, as I deſired, that there were ſeveral Doctrinal points aſſerted in your Book, to which I could not *pedibus ire*, much leſs *corde*; ſuch are many poſitions about Chriſts Righteouſneſs, about faiths Juſtification in your ſenſe, and the Efficacy of new Obedience in this work as well as faith. Yea Love made ſome kind of the actings of Faith: The good old ſound definition of Faith waved, and a new one ſubſtituted. Not the τὸ *credere*, but the τὸ *operari* alſo called into Evangelical Righteouſneſs, and this made our perſonal Righteouſneſs. Theſe things and divers others do make me vehemently diſſent from you in the matters aſſerted. Yet I do really honour you, for your great Abilities and zealous Piety, earneſtly deſiring of God that he would prolong your life, and have mercy upon hss Church by ſparing this *Epaphroditus*.

But whereas you have been told, that I had animadverſions on your Book, this was a miſtake: for the truth is, though I have caſt my thoughts upon ſome part of it, yet I have not any digeſted or prepared conſiderations about it: but do defer ſuch a work, till I ſhall have opportunity to diſcharge that part I have publiquely promiſed about imputed Righteouſneſs; which Subject I cannot yet proſecute, being hindred by other avocations: It is true, I have had advertiſement from ſome honoured friends of mine at *London*, that it is expected, I ſhould do ſomething in thoſe points, becauſe by your Inſcription of my name (which I take as an Act of your real Love and reſpect to me, though I am unworthy of any ſuch Teſtimony) they think

think I am interested. Had I known the Contents of the book before published, I would have most importunately urged you at least to have taken more time of deliberation about the divulgation of them, which you know have much novelty in them. I know things are not to be embraced or rejected, because either old or new; yet *Paul* doth dislike καινοφωνίας, if we may so read it, and not κενοφωνίας. I shall conclude with this: Let not any difference from you in Judgement be any obstruction to improve your utmost Abilities (which are many and lovely) to the finding out, and propagating of Truth. If God prolong your life, I hope this next Summer we may have mutual oral Conference together, which is the most conducible way to clear both Truth and our Opinions.

Your faithfull Friend and Brother

Decemb. 3:

To the Reverend, and his much Honoured Friend, Mr. Baxter, *Preacher of the Word of God at* Kederminster, *these Deliver.*

Sir,

I Received yours, which I acknowledge a Favour: but not so great as I expect. Your dissent is so generally known, that I cannot but hope to know some of the Grounds of it. I hope you cannot so vehemently dissent in points of such Moment, and yet deny me a discovery of mine Error. The defering of such a work till you have wrote another Book, doth intimate what will be injurious to the Church, your self

and me: If you intend to publiſh a Confutation, when I am dead, and deny me any help for conviction while I live. 1. The Church will loſe the fruit of my own Recantation. 2. And your ſelf, one part of the fruit of your Labor. 3. And I may dye in error unrecanted, and you (being now importuned for your help) be guilty of it. If you did but know how gladly I would publiquely recant, you would not deny your help. You that would have ſo importuned me to deliberate, if you had known before, I hope will not deny your aſſiſtance for my recovery. I did not haſtily that I did. But though I wanted the opportunity of conſulting you before, yet I hope it is not too late. I am confident if you know me, you are not ſo uncharitable as to think me uncurable. It is therefore your flat duty not to ſuffer ſin upon me. Let me therefore intreat you to ſend me one or two of your ſtrongeſt Arguments againſt ſome of the weightyeſt points in difference; and to anſwer mine. I know it is not an hours work with you to do that much; and I would beſtow twenty for you. If you ſuſpect that I will any way miſ-imploy your papers, you ſhall preſcribe me the Law therein your ſelf. Whether you will read κενοφωνίας or καινοφωνίας, I am indifferent, being no friend to either. I thought it a greater novelty to ſay, *Faith juſtifieth only or primarily as an Inſtrument*, then to ſay, it *juſtifieth as the Condition, which the free Lawgiver hath promiſed Juſtification upon.* I knew it was no novelty to ſay, we muſt have a perſonal Righteouſneſs beſides that imputed: And I took it to be as old as the Goſpel, to ſay, that this conſiſteth in Faith and ſincere Obedience. I called it Evangelical, becauſe I trembled to think of having an inherent Righteouſneſs which the Law of works will ſo denominate. What you ſay of the [*Efficacy of Obedience and Faith*] I diſclaim both, as never coming into my thoughts: I acknowledge no *efficiency* as to *Juſtification* in either, but a *bare conditionality.* I aver confidently that I give no more to works, then our Divines ordinarily do, *viz.* to be a ſecondary *part of the Condition of the new Covenant, and ſo of Juſtification, as continued and conſummate, and of Glorification:* only if I err, it is in giving leſs to Faith, denying it to be the *Inſtrumental Cauſe of Juſtification*, but only a condition. My Definition

tion of Faith is the same (in sense) with Dr. *Prestons*, Mr. *Culverwell*, Mr. *Throgmorton*, Mr. *Norton* of new *England* in his Catechism, *&c.* O how it grieveth me to dissent from my Reverend Brethren! Some report it to be a pernitious Book: others overvalue it, and so may receive the more hurt if it be unsound. Truly Sir I am little prejudiced against your Arguments; But had rather return into the common road then not, if I could see the Light of truth to guide me. I abhor affected singularity in Doctrine: therefore I intreat you again to defer no longer to vouchsafe me the fruit of one hours labour, which I think I may claim from your Charity and the Intereft God hath given one member in another, and you shall hereby very much oblige to thankfulness

Jan. 22. 1649.

Your unworthy fellow-servant

Richard BAXTER.

To my Reverend and very much valued friend, Mr. ——
Preacher of Gods Word at ——————

These present.

Dear Sir,

I Received your Letter, and I returned some Answer by Mr. *Bryan*, *viz.* that now the daies growing longer and warmer, I shall be glad to take occasion to confer with you mouth to mouth about those things wherein we differ; for I conceive that to be a far more compendious way, then by letters, wherein any mistake is not so easily rectified: I shall therefore be ready to give you the meeting at *Bremicham* any Thursday you shall appoint that may be convenient with your health; that so by an amicable collation, we may find out the truth. In the mean

while I shall not wholly neglect your request in your letter, but give you an hint at one of those several Arguments that move me to dissent from you; which although it be obvious, yet such Arguments as most men pitch upon, have the greatest strength: and that is the peculiar and proper expressions the Scripture giveth to faith in the matter of Justification, and that when the Doctrine is purposely handled, as *Paul* in his Epistle to the *Romans*, attributing it so to faith, as it excludes not the presence, but the co-operation of any other, He doth so include faith, as that he doth exclude all works under any notion: for *Abraham* was then godly, and abounded in other Graces, yet the Apostle fastens his Justification upon this: in so much that if a man would have desired the Apostle to make a difference between faith and other Graces, it could not have been done more evidently. As for the Apostle *James*, your sence cannot be admitted to reconcile them, but rather makes that breach wider: the one saith, a Justification without works; you make Faith as well as works, though one primarily: whereas the Orthodox both against *Papists* and *Arminians*, and *Socinians*, do sweetly reconcile them. By the hint of this, I see a Letter cannot represent the vigor of an Argument. I shall only add one thing: we may hold Opinions, and dispute them speculatively in Books; but practically, and when we come to dye, we dare not make use of them. I know not how a godly man at his death can look upon his Graces as Conditions of the Covenant fulfilled by him; though the Grace of God and the Merits of Christ be acknowledged the procuring cause. The Papists also verbally come to that refuge: For how come the Imperfections in the Conditions to be pardoned, and conditions have a moral Efficiency? *Raptim.* But of these things more fully when I see you.

The Lord preserve you an Instrument in his Church, and direct and sanctifie all your parts and abilities for his Glory.

Feb. 13. *Your loving Brother in the Lord* ———

To his very loving and much respected Friend Mr. BAXTER, *Minister of Gods Word at* Kederminster, *these be delivered.*

Sir,

Sir,

FOr the expreſſions of your love in your two Letters, and your offer to meet me for conference; I return you hearty thanks. But I told you of my weakneſs, which is ſo great, that I am not able to travel, nor to diſcourſe to any purpoſe if I were with you: a few words do ſo ſpend me (except when I have a little eaſe, which fals out perhaps once in a moneth for a few hours unexpected) therefore I am reſolved to importune you once again, and if you now deny me, to ceaſe my ſuit. It is expected at *London*, *Cambridge*, *&c.* that you write a confutation, and you intimate your purpoſe to do ſo hereafter: which I will not diſſwade you from, ſo I might but ſee your Arguments, that before I dye, I might know whether I have erred, and not dye without repenting or recanting: and if I err not, that I might ſhew you my grounds more fully; And if you deny this requeſt to one that hath ſo even unmannerly importuned you, and yet purpoſe to do it, when I can neither be the better for it, nor defend my ſelf, you walk not by that Rule as I thought you did, nor do as you would be done by. But for my part, I have done my endeavour for information, and ſo have ſatisfied my own conſcience. For what ſhould I do? There is none in this Country that will attempt a convincing of me, by word or writing, nor for ought I hear, gainſay: and you are the neareſt from whom I may hope for it. In your laſt you overpaſs all the particulars almoſt touched in your former, and pitch on Juſtification by works. Where you mention *Pauls* attributing it to Faith, to which I have anſwered, and have no Reply. 1. Where you ſay *Paul* excludes the Co-operation of any other; I anſwer, So do I. And of Faith too I deny the operations as effective. 2. When you ſay, he excludes works under any notion, I anſwer. 1. Would I could ſee that proved. 2. Then how can *James* ſay true? 3. Then he excludes faith under the notion of an Inſtrument. 4. And Repentance under

the notion of a preparative, or condition. 5. But if you mean only that he excludes the co-operation, or efficiency of works, I yield as before. 6. *Paul* expresly excludes only the works of the Law, that is, such as are considered in opposition to Christ, or co-ordination as required by the Law of Works, and not such as Christ himself enjoyneth in subordination to himself, so they keep that place of subordination. 7. *Pauls* Question is, What is the Righteousnes which must denominate a sinner just at the Bar of the Law? And this he saith is no Works (under any notion) no not Faith, but only Christs Righteousnes, and so faith must be taken relatively: for certainly it is Christ, and not Faith that is that Righteousnes. Is not this all that our Divines say, or require? and so say I, over and over. But *Paul* doth not resolve there [what is the Condition on which Christ makes over this Righteousnes of his] so directly, but collaterally. 8. Or if you say he do: yet if *Paul* speak of our first possession of Justification, I say it is without, not only the operation, but the presence of works, which is more then you say. 9. Or whether he speak of begun, or continued Justification, I say we are justified without works in *Pauls* sense: yea that they are not so much as a condition of the continuance of Justification. For works in *Pauls* sense relate to the reward as of debt, and not of Grace. As a man that works to yearn wages, as *Paul* plainly saith, *Rom.* 4.4. To him that worketh, the Reward is not of Grace, but of Debt. These works I disclaim as sinfull in their ends. But obeying the Gospel, or being willing that Christ who hath redeemed us, should rule over us, and running that we obtain, and fighting the good fight of faith, and suffering with Christ that we may be glorified with him, and improving our Talent, and enduring to the end, and so doing good works, and laying up a good foundation against the time to come: I think *Paul* excludes not any of these from being bare conditions, or *causa sine quibus non* of our Justification at Judgement, or the continuance of it here. *Abrahams* faith excluded works in *Pauls* sense, as before, but not works in this sense, or in *James* his sense. When you say my sense for reconciling *Paul* and *James* cannot be admitted. 1. I would you had told me what way to do it better:

and

and answered what I have said in that. 2. Your reason appears to me of no seeming force. For first you say [the one saith a Justification by faith without works, you make Faith as well as works, *&c.*] *Answer.* 1. *Paul* saith not barely without works, but without the works of the Law. And I have shewed you what he means by works, *Rom.* 4.4. 2. I say no more then *James*, that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only: I believe both these Scriptures are true, and need no reconciling, as having no contradiction in the terms. And yet I speak not so broad usually, as *James* doth. Where you say that [the Orthodox do sweetly reconcile them] I know not who you mean by the Orthodox. For I doubt not but you know the variety of interpretations to reconcile them. *Piscator* and *Pemble* have one Interpretation, and way of Reconciliation; *Calvin*, *Paræus* and most Divines another. *Camero* confuteth the best esteemed, and hath another. *Brochmond* with most of the *Lutherans* have another. *Jac. Laurentius*, *Althemer*, and many more tell us of divers: which of these you mean by the Orthodox, I know not. But if you exclude all those from the Orthodox, that say as I say in this, you will exclude as Learned Divines, and well reputed of, as most *Europe* hath bred, *viz.* excellent *Conrad. Bergius*, *Ludov. Crocius*, *Johan. Crocius*, *Johan. Bergius*, &c. Who though they all dispute for Justification by faith without works, understanding it of the first Justification (for most Divines have taken Justification to be rigidly *simul & semel*, till Dr. *Downam* evinced that it is a continued Act) yet they both take works for meriting works, that respect the reward as of Debt, and they say that otherwise Obedience is a Condition (or cause as they make it) of continuing, or not losing Justification once attained. And is not that to say as much as I? And many more I can name you that say as much. And you approve of Mr. *Bals* book, which saith that *works (or a purpose to walk with God) do justifie as a passive qualification of the Subject capable of Justification.* You add that [*we may dispute, &c. but you know not how a godly man at his death can look on his Graces as Conditions of the Covenant fulfilled by him; &c.*] Which speech seems strange to me. I confess if it be so, I am ungodly. For I have been as oft, and as long in

the

the expectation of death as most men, and still am: and yet I am so far from being afraid of this, that I should live and dye in horror and desperation, if I could not look upon the conditions of the Covenant of Grace fulfilled by my self through goes workings. If by our Graces you mean Habits, I think it more improper to call them the fulfilling the conditions of the Covenant. For what you say of the Papists, you know how fundamentally almost they differ from me in this, confounding the Covenants Righteousness, &c. If it were not to one that knows it better then my self, I would shew wherein. For your question, How come the imperfections in our conditions to be pardoned? You know I have fully answered it, both in the Aphorisms, and Appendix. And I would rather you had given me one discovery of the insufficiency of that answer, then asked the Question again. Briefly thus. Guilt is an obligation to punishment (as it is here to be understood) Pardon is a freeing from that Obligation, or Guilt and Punishment. All Punishment is due by some Law. According to the Law or Covenant of Works the imperfection of our Faith, Love, Obedience, &c. deserve punishment, and Christ hath satisfied that Law, and procured forgiveness of these imperfections, and so acquit us from Guilt and punishment. The new Law, or Covenant of Grace doth not threaten death to any but final Unbelievers, and so not to the imperfection of our Faith, Love, Obedience, where they are sincere. And where the Law threatneth not Punishment, there is no obligation to Punishment (or Guilt) on the party from that Law, and so no work for Pardon. Imperfect believers perform the conditions of the new Covenant truly: and it condemneth none for imperfection of degree, where there is sincerity: No man is ever pardoned, whom the new Law condemneth, that is, final Unbelievers, or Rejecters of Christ. So that Christ removeth, or forgiveth that obligation to punishment, which by the Law of Works doth fall on us for our imperfections. And for the Law of Grace where it obligeth not to punishment, that obligation which is not, cannot be taken off: nor that man pardoned, that was never guilty. Your Question occasioneth me to be unmannerly in opening these easie things to you, that I doubt

not

not knew them sure twenty years ago and more. Though I confess I had not the clear apprehensions of them seven years ago. What ever I was then thought by others, I confess I was ignorant, and am glad that God hath in any measure healed my ignorance, though with the loss of my reputation of being Orthodox. Where you add that conditions have a moral efficiency, either you mean all or some; if all, or if this whereof we are in speech, though I am loth to contest with you in Philosophy, yet I must confess I never read so much in any Author, nor can force my self to believe it, *Causa sine quanon, est causa fatua.* It is as *Schibler* and others, a meer Antecedent. The word *Moral* is ambiguous; but if you mean it as I conjecture you do for an efficiency, interpretative in sense of Law, as if the Law would ascribe efficiency to him that fulfills the condition: I utterly deny it in the present case; or if you mean that our fulfilling the conditions hath an efficiency on God to move him to justifie us, as an impulsive procatarctick cause; I not only deny it, but deny that any such cause is properly with God, or hath efficiency on him; nor can it have the operation of the final cause, which some call moral, seeing it is none of Gods end, nor can any thing move God but God, nor be his end but himself. If you mean by moral efficiency any thing else which is indeed no efficiency, I stick not on meer words.

Sir, I should not have presumed to expect so much labour from you as to write a sheet for my satisfaction, had I not perceived that others expect much more to less purpose, and that your letters express that hereafter you intend more. If you deny me your answer to this, I will trouble you no more. And because I would have your labour as short as may be, I shall only desire your answer to these few Questions, which I ground on both your Letters, because the clear resolving of these, will be the readiest way to satisfie me.

Quest. 1. Hath the Covenant of Grace (which promiseth Justification and Glorification) any condition on our parts, or none? If it have

Quest. 2. What are the Conditions? Is not Love and Obedience part of the Condition?

Quest. 3. Must not those Conditions be fulfilled by our selves?

or hath Christ fulfilled them by himself for any man.

Queſt. 4. If we muſt fulfill them, why may not a dying man look on them? Or what means *Paul* to rejoyce in the teſtimony of his Conſcience, that in ſimplicity and godly ſincerity he had his converſation? *&c.* And that he had fought a good fight, and finiſhed his courſe, *&c.* and that in all good conſcience, *&c.* and *Hezekiah*, Remember Lord that I have walked before thee, *&c.*

Queſt. 5. Can a man have any aſſurance ordinarily that death ſhall not let him into Hell, who hath no aſſurance that he hath performed theſe conditions, and how ſhould he have it? Can he know that all ſhall work to him for good, though he know not whether he love God? or that there is no condemnation to him, though he know not that he is in Chriſt, and walk not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit?

Queſt. 6. If our Love and Obedience have no tendency to ſalvation, but as meer figures, then is not the Antinomian Doctrine true, that we may not Act for Salvation?

Q. 7. What do you mean your ſelf, when you write againſt thoſe that deny *Repentance to be a Condition to qualifie the Subject to obtain forgiveneſs, but a ſign* Lect. 20. of Juſtification? And when you ſay that *Scripture limits Juſtification, and Pardon only to thoſe Subjects that are ſo and ſo qualified.* p. 171. where you inſtance *in Repentance, Confeſſion, Turning, Forgiving others, &c.* and make faith an *Inſtrumental cauſe*, but ſay, *there are many qualifications in the Subject.* p. 172. And what mean you when you ſay, *p.* 210. *In ſome groſs ſins there are many conditions requiſite (beſides humiliation) without which Pardon of ſin cannot be obtained* : where you inſtance in *Reſtitution.* Beſides thoſe, *p.* 148, 149, 150. Is it not ſafe when a man hath prerformed theſe conditions, to *look on them either living or dying?* Or what do you ſay leſs then I do here? I know you are none of the men of contention, and therefore will not recant your own Doctrine in oppoſition to me. And if you did not mean that theſe *are* conditions of Pardon, and Juſtification, when you ſay *they are*, who can underſtand you? If thoſe *groſs ſins* be in the unjuſtified, you will not ſay that the conditions of his Pardon are no conditions of his Juſtification. I know that you

give

give *more to faith* (and so to man) then I do, *viz.* to be the *Instrument of his own Justification*, (which I will not contend against with any that by an improper sense of the word Instrument, do differ only in a term) but what do you give *less to Repentance*, and the rest then I do? you say they are conditions, and I say no more.

Qu. 8 And what do the generality of our Divines mean, when they say that Faith and new Obedience are our conditions of the Covenant? As I have cited out of *Parem*, *Scharpius*, *Willet*, *Piscator*, *Junius*, *Aretius*, *Alstedius*, who saith, the condition of the new Covenant of Grace is partly faith, and partly Evangelical Obedience, or Holiness of life, proceeding from faith in Christ. *Distinct. Chap.* 17. *p.* 73. And *Wendelin* the like, *&c.* If it be said that they mean they are conditions of Salvation but not of Justification; Then

Quest. 9. Whether and how it can be proved that our final Justification at Judgement (which you have truly shewed is more compleat then this *Justificatio viæ*, and our Glorification have different conditions on our part, and so of our persevering Justification here.

Quest. 10. And whether it be any less disparagement to Christ to have mans works to be the conditions of his Salvation, then to be the bare conditions of his ultimate and continued Justification? Seeing Christ is a Saviour as properly as a Justifier, and Salvation comprizeth all.

Quest. 11. What tolerable sense can be given of that multitude of plain Scriptures which I have cited? *Thes.* 60. For my part, when I have oft studyed how to forsake my present Judgement, the bare reading of the 25 of *Matthew* hath still utterly silenced me, if there were no more. Much more when the whole Gospel runs in the like strain.

Quest. 12. Is not the fulfilling of the conditions of the new Law or Covenant enough to denominate the party righteous, that is, not guilty of non-fulfilling, or not obliged to punishment, or guilty as from that same Law or Covenant? And doth not every man that is saved so fulfill the conditions of the new Covenant? and so is Evangelically righteous? The condition is not *Believe, and obey perfectly*, but *sincerely*.

Queſt. 13. If there be no ſuch thing as a perſonal Righteouſneſs neceſſary to ſalvation, beſides imputed Righteouſneſs: 1. What is the meaning of all thoſe Scriptures cited *Theſ.* 22. that ſay there is? 2. And of our Divines that ſay there is inherent Righteouſneſs? And 3. What real difference between the godly and the wicked, the ſaved and damned?

Queſt. 14. Have you found out any lower place for Love and Obedience, then to be bare conditions, if you acknowledge them any way conducible to final Juſtification, or Salvation? If you have, what place is it? and how called? and why hath it not been diſcovered unto the world? To ſay they are *qualifications of the Subject*, is too general, and comprizeth qualifications of different Natures; and it ſhews not how they are conducible to the ſaid ends; and why a man may not be ſaved without qualifications, as well as with them, if God have not made them ſo much as conditions?

Queſt. 15. Seeing I aſcribe not to Evangelical Obedience the leaſt part of Chriſts Office or Honor, nor make it any jot of our legal Righteouſneſs, where then lies the error or danger of my Doctrine?

Queſt. 16. Do not thoſe men that affirm we have an inherent Righteouſneſs, which is ſo pronounced properly by the Law of works, accuſe the Law of God for bleſſing and curſing the the ſame man and action? And how can that Law pronounce a man, or his action righteous, which curſeth him, and condemneth him to Hell for that ſame Action? It makes me amazed to think what ſhould be the reaſon that Divines conteſt ſo much, that it is the Law of Works that pronounceth them inherently righteous, which they know condemns them; rather then the Law of Grace or new Covenant, which they know abſolveth them that ſincerely perform it. When all Divines acknowledge an inherent Righteouſneſs, and that the Law of Works is fulfilled by none, and that it pronnunceth none righteous, but the fulfillers: and when the condition of the new Covenant muſt be performed by all that will be ſaved: and when the Holy Ghoſt ſaith that it was by faith (and ſo pronounced, and meaſured by the Law of faith) that *Abel* (the ſecond Righteous man in the world) offered the excellent Sacrifice, and by it obtained

tained witnes that he was righteous, God testifying of his gift, &c. *Heb.* 11.4.

Quest. 17. Do not those Divines that will affirm that [our inherent Righteousnes is so called from its imperfect conformity to the Law of works] and that [it is the Law that pronounceth them righteous] lay a clear grouud for Justification by works in the worst sense? for if the Law pronounce their works, and them properly righteous, then it justifieth them: and then what need have they (at least so far) of Christ, or Pardon? yea and what Law shall condemn them, if the Law of Works justifie them? At least do they not compound their Righteousnes (as to the law of Works) partly of Christs satisfaction, and partly of their own Works?

Quest. 18. Whether you should not blame Dr. *Preston*, Mr. *Norton*, Mr. *Culverwel*, Mr. *Throgmorton*, &c. for laying by the good sound definition of Faith (as you call it) as well as me? And is it not great partiality to let the same pass as currant from them, which from me must be condemned? And why would you agree to such a corrupt definition, being one of the Assembly, when theirs in the lesser Catechism (and indeed both) is in sence the very same with mine? And why may not I be judged Orthodox in that point, when I heartily subscribe to the National Assemblies Definition? *viz.* that *Faith is a saving Grace, whereby we receive, and rest on Christ alone for Salvation, as he is offered to us in the Gospel.*]

Qu. 19. Do I say any more then the Assembly saith in the preceding Question? [*What doth God require of us, that we may escape his wrath and curse due to us for sin?* Answ. *God requireth of us (to escape the said wrath and curse, &c.) Faith in Jesus Christ, repentance unto life, with the diligent use of all the outward means, whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of Redemption.*] And is not Justification one benefit? And is not final Justification a freeing us from that Curse?

Quest. 20. Which call you the good, sound definition of Faith? When our famous Reformers placed it in Assurance; *Camero*, and others in perswasion (such as is in the understanding) others in Assent, as Dr. *Downam*, &c. Others in a Belief of Gods special Love, and that sin is pardoned. Others in Affi-

ance or Recumbency. Others in divers of these. Some, as Mr. *Ball*, calling it a fiducial Assent. Others an obediential Affiancce. Did not each of these forsake that which by the former was accounted the good sound Definition? And why may not I with Dr. *Preston*, Mr. *Wallis*, &c. say it is an *Acceptance, or consent, joyned with Assent?* or with the Assembly, and the rest, say it is a *receiving*, which is the same in a more Metaphorical term.

Quest. 21. If you judge as *Melanchton*, *John Crocius*, *Davenant*, *Amesius*, &c. that Faith is in both faculties; how can you then over-leap the Elicite Acts of the will (which have respect to means) *Eligere, consentire, uti?*

Quest. 22. If the formal reason of justifying faith lie in a Belief or Perswasion that Christ will pardon and save us: or in an Affiance or resting on him, or Trusting to him only for Salvation: or in an Acceptance of him as a Saviour, meerly to justifie and save from Hell: Why then are not almost all among us justified and saved? when I scarce meet with one of an hundred, that is not unfeignedly willing, that Christ should pardon, and justifie, and save them, and do verily trust, that Christ will do it; and the freer it is, the better they like it. If they may whore and drink, and be covetous, and let alone all the practise of Godliness, and yet be saved, they will consent. If it be said that they rest not on Christ for Justification sincerely; I *Ans.* They do it really, and unfeignedly, and not dissemblingly, which as we may know in all probability by others, so we may know it certainly by our own hearts, while unregenerate. So that it is not the natural, but the moral Truth, that is wanting: And what is that? And wherein is the Essential, formal difference between a wicked mans resting on Christ for Justification, and a true Believers? To say it is seen in the fruits, is not to shew the Essential difference.

Quest. 23. If resting on Christ for Justification be the only condition of final Justification, What is the reason that *Perkins*, *Bolton*, *Hooker*, *Preston*, *Taylor*, *Elton*, *Whately*, and all the godly Divines also yet living do spend most of their labour to bring men to obey Christ as their Lord, and not the hundreth line or word to press them to Trust that he will pardon and save them? All the

powerfull

powerfull Preachers that ever I heard, however they dispute, yet when they are preaching to the generality of people, they zealously cry down lazines, lukewarmnes, negligence, unholynes, prophanes, &c. As that which would be the liklyest cause of the damnation of the people. But if only the foresaid faith be the condition, and all other Graces or Duties be but meer signal effects of this, and signal qualifications of the subject, and not so much as conditions, what need all this? Were it not then better to perswade all people, even when they are whoring, or drunk, to trust on Christ to pardon and justifie them? And then when they have the tree and cause, the fruits and signal effects will follow.

Quest. 24. Yea, Why do the best Divines preach so much against Presumption? And what is Presumption, if it be not this very faith which Divines call justifying? *viz.* the Trusting to Christ for Pardon and Salvation only, without taking him for their King and Prophet? If it be said that this last must be present, though not justifie: How can the bare presence of an idle Accident so make, or marr the efficacy of the cause?

Quest. 25. If to be unwilling that Christ should raign over us, be part of the directly condemning sin, *Luke* 19. 27. why is not the willingnes he should raign, part of saving, justifying faith?

Quest. 26. Seeing resting in Christ is no Physical apprehension of him (who is bodily in Heaven) nor of his Righteousnes (which is not a being capable of such an apprehension) How can that Resting justifie more then any other Act but only as it is the condition to which the Promise is made? Resting on a friend for a Benefit, makes it not yours, but his gift does that. As *Perkins* (cited by me) *To believe the Kingdom of France shall be mine, makes it not mine: But to believe Christ, and the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* (*vid. loc.* where he saith as much as I) *vol.* 1. *p.* 662. If God had not said [*He that believeth shall be justified and saved,*] would *Believing* have done it? And if he had said, [*He that repenteth, or loveth, or calleth on the name of the Lord, shall be justified or saved*] would not these have done it? if so; then doth not faith justifie directly, as the condition of the Gift, Promise, or new Covenant?

nant? And its *apprehenſion* is but its *aptitude* to be ſet apart for this Office: And if it juſtifie as a condition of the Promiſe: muſt not others do it ſo far as they are parts of the Condition?

Sir, If you ſhould deny me the favour I hope for in reſolving theſe doubts, yet let me hear whether I may expect it or not. And in the *interim* I ſhall ſearch in jealouſie, and pray for direction: But till your Arguments ſhall change my judgement, I remain confident that I can maintain moſt of the *Antinomian* Dotages againſt any man that denyeth the principles of my Book: and that which is accounted novelty in it, is but a more explicate, diſtinct, neceſſary delivery of common Truths.

Yours,

RICHARD BAXTER.

April 5.
1650.

Sir,

I Am ſorry that you are not in capacity for the motion I profered: I thought diſcourſe would not ſo much infeeble you, eſpecially when it would have been in ſo loving a way: And I judged it the more feaſable, becauſe I had been informed of a late ſolemn conference you had about *Pædobaptiſm*, which could not but much ſpend you. I ſhall preſs no more for it, although this very letter doth abundantly confirm me, that letters are but a loſs of time: for one word might have prevented many large digreſſions. Is not that endeavour of yours in your ſeventh queſtion to prove out of my book, that Repentance is a neceſſary condition, or qualification in the Subject to be pardoned, *&c.* a meer impertinency? You earneſtly deſire ſatisfaction of your conſcience, therefore I cannot think you do

do wilfully miſtake. For is that the ſtate of the queſtion with us? Is it not this, whether the Goſpel Righteouſneſs be made ours, otherwiſe then by believing? You ſay by believing, and Obedience, I ſay only believing. I ſay faith is only the condition juſtifying, or inſtrument receiving, you make a juſtifying Repentance, a juſtifying Patience: you make other acts of grace juſtifying as well: ſo that whereas heretofore, we only had juſtifying faith, now there are as many other qualities, and all juſtifying, as there are Graces. So that I do firmly hold (and it needs no recantation) that repentance and other exerciſes of Grace are antecedent qualifications, and are *media ordinata*, in the uſe whereof only pardon can be had. But what is this to you? Who expreſly maintain the righteouſneſs of the Covenant of Grace to be made ours, upon our godly working, as well as believing. If therefore you had ſpent your ſelf to ſhew that faith had no peculiar Inſtrumentality in our Juſtification, but what other Graces have, then you had hit the mark. What is more obvious, then that there are many conditions *in juſtificato*, which are not *in actu juſtificationis*? The faſtening of the head to the body is a neceſſary condition *in homine vidente*, but it is not *in actu videntis*. You grant indeed ſome precedency to faith, but you make Faith and Works *æquè*, though not *æqualiter*, the conditions of Juſtification. I ſhould ſay much more to the ſtate of the queſtion, but I forbear: In other things you ſeem to come off; and though I do not ſay you recede from your Aſſertions, yet you much mollifie them, that I need not therein contend with you. But here is the ſtick. Let it be demonſtrated, that whereas the Scripture in the current of it attributes Juſtification to believing only: as *through faith*, and by *Faith*, and through *faith in his blood*, that you can as truly ſay, its received by love, and its through love of his blood ſhed for our ſakes, *&c.* This is a little of that much which might be ſaid to the ſtate of the queſtion. This I judge new Doctrine, juſtifying Repentance, juſtifying Charity. And in my Letter I laid down an Argument, *Rom.* 4. Concerning *Abrahams* Juſtification, the Pattern of all others. To this you reckon up many Anſwers, but I ſee not the Argument ſhaken by it. Firſt you ſay, you *exclude a co-ope-*

ration effective, but why do we strive about words? You do not exclude *works justifying*, as well as faith, let the expressions be what they will. Whereas *Paul* saith, he *would be found having the Righteousness which is by faith*, you will add, *and which is by love, by zeal.* 2. You desire *it to be proved, that* Paul *excludes all works under any notion*; I think its very easily done: First, because of the *immediate opposition* between Faith and Works; now you will contradict *Pauls* Argument, and give a *tertium*, works that are of Grace. But the Apostles opposition is so immediate here and in other places, between faith and any thing of ours, that he admits of no *medium*. 2. He instances in *Abrahams* works, and excludes them: now were *Abrahams* works, works done by the meer strength of the Law? Did not *Abrahams* Obedience, and other works flow from Grace? Were *Abrahams* works in opposition to Christ? Yet even these are excluded. 3. He excludes all works under any notion by the opposition, justifying, covering, all is wholly attributed unto God. 4. The Assertion is universal: The Apostle saith, without works in general, *ver. 6.* And he works not, *ver. 5.* Lastly, By the testimony he brings from the *Psalmist*, that blessedness is where sin is not imputed, whrere it is forgiven; These reasons do evidence that he excludes works under all notions in the act of Justification, though not from the person justified. 3. You say, *how then saith* James *true*? But I ask, if there be justifying works, how saith *Paul* true? But again, *James* saith true: for this faith which in respect of its act *ad intra*, doth only justifie, yet it works *ad extra*. The old Assertion is *fides quæ viva*, not *qua viva*. You speak of a seeming Antilogie among the orthodox in this reconciliation, but though all go not *eadem semitâ*, yet they do *eadem viâ* against works under any notion whatsoever in the act of Justification. 4. You argue that faith as an Instrument is excluded. Thus *Bellarmine* also, *apprehendere est opus*, therefore faith is excluded: But *non sequitur*: Faith is passive in its Instrumentality; and although to believe, be a *Grammatical action*, its *verbum activum*, yet its *physicn, or* ὑποστατικὴ *passive*. A man by believing, doth not *operari*, but *recipere*: As *videre, audire* are *Grammatical actions*, but *Physical or natural passions*: now you cannot say thus of the exercises of other

other Graces: this is the seeming strength of your Exceptions. For Repentance is not excluded as *qualifying*, but as *recipient*, which is a fifth Exception.

As for your discourse, whether *Paul* disputes what is our Righteousness? or upon what terms it is made over to us, it doth not much matter; for indeed *Paul* speaks to both those only inclusively or collaterally, as you say: but that which he chiefly intends, is to shew in what manner we are justified, whether by believing or working, and these he makes two immediate opposites, not granting any *tertium*. You speak of Faith taken relatively for Christs Righteousness; but how can you find out such a figure for faith in your sence, unless you will acknowledge Love or Obedience relatively for Christs Righteousness? Indeed those that hold Faith instrumentally, receiving the whole righteousness of Christ, and no other Grace, they often speak of faith taken relatively, but so cannot you, who hold that not only seeing this brazen Serpent, but any other actions of sence will as well heal the wounded Christian. You say you acknowledge the Assemblies definition of resting or receiving, you cannot take in that sence, as they declare it, as the Scripture words which are Metaphorical, do imply: for its the resting of a burdened soul upon Christ only for Righteousness, and by this Christs Righteousness is made over to us; and its a receiving of Christ, as the hand embraceth any Object: now you make the Righteousness of Christ made over to us in any other exercise of Grace as well as this. So that although you would willingly seem not to recede from others, yet you plainly do: and although you think your Assertions are but more distinct explications, yet they are indeed destructive Assertions to what our Divines do deliver: neither may you, while you intend to dispute, exactly build upon some homiletical or popular expression in any mans book.

You reply to a second part in my Letter: whether a godly man dying, may be affected according to your position, and thereupon you instance in *Hezekiah*, *Paul*, and that no man can dye with comfort without the evidence of these works. But is this the state of the question with us? Do you think that I deny a godly life to be a comfortable testimony, and a necessary qualification of a man for pardon? You cannot think that you

speak to the point in this. But here is the question, Can a godly man dying, think the Righteousnes of Christ is made his by working or believing? Is it repent, and Christs Righteousnes is by this made yours, and rest in Christ? Certainly the dying Christian is in agonies directed to this resting on Christ, to the eying of this brazen Serpent, not to be found in any thing but the Righteousnes by faith. Its an act of Dependance, not of Obedience that interests us in Christs Righteousnes. Its that puts on the robes of Christ, that our nakednes may not appear. And that is very harsh still, which you expres, to expect the Righteousnes of the Covenant of Grace upon the conditions fulfilled by your self, through Gods working. I am unwilling to parallel this with some passages that might be quoted out of unsound Authors; but that I am confident, howsoever your Pen-writes, you have a *tutissimum est* to rest only upon Christs Righteousnes, and that by bare resting, and beleiving you look for a Righteousnes. As Philosophers say, we see or hear *intus recipiendo*, not *extra mittendo*: otherwise *Bellarmine* argues consonantly enough, that Love would justifie as well as faith; but we say that *Faith doth* pati, *Love doth* agere. Not but that faith is an *active* grace, only in *this act it is meer recipient.*

Sir, I have not time, nor paper to answer those many questions, the most of which I conceive impertinent to this business: and your Explication of your self, how imperfections in our Graces, are done away, and yet the conditions of righteousnes, is to me παραδειξ. τατον: but I cannot go any further. What I have written with much love and respect to you, I should account it a great mercy to be instrumental to bring you to the right way again: If there be so much Joy for reducing a wandring sheep, be not offended if I say there will be much more for an erring shepheard: though I hope at last your error may prove in words rather then in sence: with heartly brotherly love I have written this, and so let it be received from your fellow-labourer, who honours Gods gifts in you, and is also sensible of his own infirmities, and proneness to err.

Dear

Dear Sir,

IF you doubt of the truth of my bodily infirmity, it is becauſe you neither know my body nor mind. The diſpute at *Bewdley*, as it was almoſt at home, ſo I had the choice of the time, and ſuch ſtrength vouchſafed from God, which I cannot again expect, much leſs promiſe my ſelf. I told you I have ſome *lucida intervalla*, perhaps a few hours in a moneth: but if upon ſuch uncertainty I ſhould draw you to a journey, and then ten to one fail you, I ſhould be injurious. But ſeeing you ſo far and freely condiſcend, if God wil ſhew me ſo much Mercy, as to enable this reſtleſs unceſſantly-pained *Sceleton* to ſuch a work, I ſhall be bold to ſend you word, and claim the favour you offer. In the mean time it is my duty to let you know, I have received your Letter, and to return you hearty thanks for it, though it be not that which I hoped for, and ſhall now ceaſe to expect. I am convinced now as well as you that Letters are but a loſs of time: but your Arguments or direct anſwers to my Queſtions, would have been for my advantage, a precious improvement of it: but ſeeing I may not be ſo happy, I muſt reſt content. It ſtill ſeemeth to my weak underſtanding to be no impertinency to prove that your ſelf affirm Repentance, Confeſſion, Turning, Forgiveing others, *&c.* to be more then ſigns, *i. e.* to be conditions to qualifie the Subject to obtain forgiveneſs; and to tell you that I ſay no more, and to tell you ſtill, that you give more to faith (and ſo to man) then I; but I give no more to works for ought I deſcern then you; I am ſure then our ordinary Divines do: And if I do miſtake herein, you have little reaſon to ſuſpect me of willfulneſs; though of weakneſs as much as you pleaſe. As for the ſtate of the Queſtion between us, which you ſpeak of, I am a ſtranger to it, and know not what you mean. I never came to the ſtating of a Queſtion with you; nor did you ſtate any to me in your letters, but mentioned your vehement diſſent from ſeveral paſſages in my book, and therefore I had reaſon to think that you fell upon the Queſtions as there they were ſtated; ſo that it is *intimè & medullitùs*, pertinent to my queſtion, which is impertinent to yours.

You say the question is, [*Whether the Gospel righteousness be made ours otherwise then by believing* ?] and tell me that I say [*by believing and obedience*] when I never stated such a question, nor ever gave such an answer. I suppose by [*Gospel Righteousness*] you mean Christs Righteousness given to Believers: Now I have affirmed that [*those only shall have part in Christs satisfaction, and so in him be legally righteous, who do believe and obey the Gospel, and so are in themselves Evangelically righteous.*] But your phrase [*made ours*] doth intimate that our first possession of Christs Righteousness should be upon Obedience as well as Faith; which I never affirmed: But Christs Righteousness is *continued* ours on condition of obeying him, though not *made* ours so: and we shall be justified at Judgement also on that condition. As it is not marriage duty, but Contract which is the condition of a womans first Interest in her Husband and his riches; but marriage duty and the performance of that Covenant, is the condition of her Interest as continued. And indeed it is much of my care in that Book to shun and avoid that question which you say is stated between us: for I knew how much ambiguity is in the Word [*By*] which I was loth to play with. I know we are justified By God the Father, By Christs satisfaction, By Christs absolution, By the Gospel Covenant or Promise, By the Sacraments, By Faith, By Works; (for I will never be ashamed to speak the words of the Holy Ghost) By our words (for so saith Christ) Therefore if you will needs maintain in general, that Christs Righteousness is made ours, no otherwise then by beleiving, nor otherwise continued ours; you see how much you must exclude. But to remove such Ambiguity, I distinguish between justifying [*By*] as an efficient instrumental Cause, and [*By*] as by a condition: and I still affirm that Works or Obedience do never justifie as any cause, much less such a cause; but that by them as by a condition appointed by the free Lawgiver and Justifier we are finally justified. And truly Sir, it is past my reach at present to understand what you say less in this then I, except you differ only about the word [*By*], and not the sence; and think that it is improper to say that Pardon or Justification is *By* that which is but a condition: You seem here to drive all at this, and yet me thinks you

you ſhould not. 1. Becauſe you affirm your ſelf, that conditions have a moral efficiency: and then it ſeems when you ſay Repentance, Confeſſion, *&c.* are conditions, you mean they are morally efficient; which is a giving more to works then ever I did. 2. Becauſe you know it is the phraſe of Chriſt and his Spirit, that we are juſtified *By* our words and works; and it is ſafe ſpeaking in Scripture phraſe. 3. Becauſe you ſay after that my Aſſertions are deſtructive of what Divines deliver: but the word *By*, if we are agreed in the ſence, cannot be deſtructive; and except the phraſe only *By*, *&c.* be the difference, where is it? When you ſay Repentance, *&c.* are conditions, and I ſay they are no more: and I have nothing from you of any diſagreement about the ſence of the word *condition*. Leſt you ſhould doubt of my meaning in that, I underſtand it as in our uſual ſpeech it is taken, and as Lawyers and Divines generally do, viz. *Eſt Lex addita negotio, quæ donec præſtetur, eventum ſuſpendit. Vel eſt modus, vel cauſa quæ ſuſpendit id quod agitur, quoad ex poſt facto confirmetur, ut Cujacius.* And whereas Conditions are uſually diſtinguiſht into *poteſtativas, cauſales & mixtas, ſeu communes*, I mean *conditiones poteſtativas*. Where you add that you ſay only faith is the condition juſtifying. *&c.* but I make a juſtifying Repentance, *&c.* And whereas heretofore we had only juſtifying faith, now, *&c.*] I anſwer, 1. If by juſtifying Repentance, *&c.* you mean that which is (as you ſay Faith is) an inſtrument or efficient Cauſe, I never dreamed of any ſuch: If as a Condition; you confeſs it your ſelf. 2. If you ſpeak againſt the ſence, we are agreed in that for ought I know: If againſt the phraſe, then juſtifying Faith or Repentance is no Scripture phraſe: but to be juſtified By faith, and By works, and By words, are all Scripture phraſes. You ſay, *you firmly hold that Repentance and other Exerciſes of Grace are antecedent qualifications, and* media ordinata, *in the uſe whereof only Pardon can be had: but what is this to me?* &c. I anſwer. 1. Add *conditions* as you do in your Book, and you ſay as much as I. 2. If by the other exerciſes of Grace you mean the particulars in your book enumerated, or the like; and if by *Pardon*, you mean even the firſt pardon (as the word *Only* ſhews you do) then you go quite beyond me, and give far more to thoſe exerciſes

ciſes of grace then I dare do. For I ſay that Chriſt and all his imputed Righteouſneſs, is made ours, and we pardoned and juſtified at firſt without any works or obedience more then bare faith, (and what is precedent in its place or concomitant) and that *bona opera ſequuntur juſtificatum non præcedunt juſtificandum*, in regard of our firſt juſtification. I dare not ſay, they are Antecedents or *media ordinata*. Where you add, *What is that to you that make the righteouſneſs of the Covenant of grace to be made ours upon our godly working*. &c. I anſwer, 1. I have ſhewed it is as much as I ſay, if not more, [*upon*] intending but a condition or *medium ordinatum*. 2. I never ſaid what you ſay I maintain in phraſe or ſenſe (if the word [*made*] intend either efficiency or any cauſality, or the firſt poſſeſſion of R ghteouſneſs. 3. You much uſe the harſh phraſe of [*working*] as here [*Godly working*] as mine; which I doubt whether ever I uttered or uſed; And the term [*works*] I little uſe, but in the explication of *James*. For I told you that I diſclaim works in *Pauls* ſenſe, *Rom.* 4. 4. which make the reward not of grace, but of debt. You add [*If therefore you had ſpent your ſelf to ſhew that faith hath no peculiar inſtrumentality in our juſtification but what other graces have, then you had hit the mark.*] *Anſw.* I confeſs Sir you now come to the point in difference. But do you not hereby confeſs that I give no more to works then you, but only leſs to faith? Why then do you ſtill harp upon the word [*works*] as if I did give more to them? the task you now ſet me is to prove that faith doth no more, and not that works do ſo much: That faith is not an inſtrument, and not that love or obedience are conditions. And to this I anſwer you: 1. I have in my book ſaid ſomewhat to prove faith no inſtrument of juſtifying, and you ſaid nothing againſt it. Why then ſhould I aim at this mark? 2. I think I have proved there that faith juſtifieth primarily and properly as the condition of the Covenant, and but remotely as *A receiving juſtification*, this which you call the inſtrumentality, being but the very formal nature of the act, and ſo the *quaſi materia* or its aptitude to the office of Juſtifying. And becauſe I build much on this ſuppoſition, I put it in the *Queries*, which you judge impertinent. 3. Yet if you will underſtand the word *inſtrument* laxely, I have not any where

denyed

denyed faith to have such an instrumentality (that is, receiving or apprehensiveness) above other graces: Only I deny and most *confidently* deny that that is the formal, proper or neerest cause of faith's justifying: But the formal reason is, because God hath made it the condition of the Covenant, promising justification to such receiving, which else would have no more justified then any other act: And therefore so far as others are made conditions, and the promise to us on them, they must needs have some such use as well as faith: And that they are conditions, you confess as much as I. 4. But what if I be mistaken in this point? what is the danger? If faith should deserve the name of an instrument, when I think it is but a condition? 1. Is it any danger to give less to faith then others, while I give no less to Christ? (For if you should think I gave less to Christ then others, I should provoke you again and again to shew wherein.) 2. I deny nothing that Scripture saith: It saith not that faith is an instrument: (perhaps you will tell me *Veronius* argues thus: But I mean it is neither in the letter nor plain sense; and then I care not who speaks it, if true.) 3. You make man an efficient cause of justifying himself. (For the instrument is an efficient cause): And what if I dare not give so much to man? is there any danger in it? or should I be spoke against for the Doctrine of obedience, as *if I gave more* to man then you, when I give so much less? 4. Those that dissent from me do make the very natural act of faith, which is most essential to it, and inseparable from it, as it from it self; *viz. Its apprehension of Christs Righteousness*, to be the proper primary reason of its justifying. What if I dare not do so, but give that glory to God, and not to the nature of our own act? and say, that *Fides quæ recipit justificat, sed non qua recipit* primarily, but as it is the condition which the free justifier hath conferred this honour upon? is there any danger in this? and will there be joy in heaven for reducing a man from such an opinion?

You say, [*What more obvious then that there are many conditions in* justificato, *which are not* in actu justificationis: *The fastning the head to the body, &c.*] Answ. 1. You said before that they are Antecedents *& Media ordinata*, and then they are

ſure conditions *in juſtificando* as well as *in juſtificato*. 2. Your mention of the condition *in homine vidente* is *beſides* our buſineſs, and is only of a natural condition, or *qualification in genere naturæ*; When we are ſpeaking only of an active condition *in genere moris*: The former is improperly, the later properly called a condition. 3. If this be your meaning, I confeſs there are many natural or paſſive qualifications neceſſary, which are no active or proper moral conditions in a Law-ſenſe; But this is nothing to the matter. 4. The phraſes of [*Conditions in juſtificato, & in actu juſtificationis*] are ambiguous, and in the Moral ſenſe improper. Our queſtion is whether they are conditions *ad juſtificationem recipiendam*: Which yet in regard of time are *in actu juſtificationis*, but not *conditiones vel qualificationes ipſius actus*. And if you did not think that repentance is a condition *ad juſtificationem recipiendam*, and ſo *in actu juſtificationis*, how can you ſay it is *medium ordinatum? A medium*, as ſuch, eſſentially hath ſome tendency or conduciblenes to its end. 5. As obvious therefore as you think this is, it is paſt the reach of my dull apprehenſion to conceive of your conditions in a judiciary ſenſe, which are *in juſtificato* for the obtaining of juſtification, and not be both *ad actum & in actu juſtificationis*: for I ſuppoſe you are more accurate and ſerious then by the word condition to mean *modum vel affectionem entis Metaphyſicam, vel ſubjecti alicujus adjunctum vel qualificationem in ſenſo Phyſico*, when we are ſpeaking only of conditions *in ſenſu forenſi*. And there are many thouſand honeſt Chriſtians as dull as I, and therefore I do not think it can be any weighty point of faith which muſt be ſupported by ſuch ſubtilties which are paſt our reach, though obvious to yours: God uſeth not to hang mens ſalvation on ſuch School diſtinctions which few men can underſtand. 6. And every ſuch Tyro in Philoſophy as I, cannot reach your Phyloſophical ſubtilty neither; to underſtand that the faſtning of the head to the body is not *conditio in actu videntis*; (though it be nothing to our purpoſe); Indeed we may think it of more remote uſe then ſome other, and but *propter aliud, & quaſi conditio conditionis*; and if you ſay ſo of Repentance, &c. we ſhould not diſagree.

You ſay [*In other things I come off, and ſo mollifie my aſſerti-*

ons

ons, that you need not contend] *Answ.* 1. I would you had told me wherein I so come off: For I know not of a word. If you mean in that I now say, obedience is no condition of our first attaining justification, but only of the continuance of it, *&c.* I said the same over and over in my book, and left it should be over-lookt, I put it in the Index of distinctions. If you mean not this, I know not what you mean. 2. But if explication of my self will so mollifie and prevent contending, I shall be glad to explain my self yet further: Yea, and heartily to recant where I see my error. For that which you desire, *I demonstrate that its By love, and Through love, &c.* I have answered before by distinguishing of the sense of *By* and *Through*: and in my sense I have brought you forty plain Texts in my book for proof of it, which shew it is no new Doctrine.

To your argument from *Rom.* 4. Where you say that *Abrahams justification is the pattern of all others*, I conceive that an uncouth speech, strange to Scripture for phrase and proper sense, though in a large sense tolerable and true: Certain I am that *Paul* brings *Abrahams* example to prove that we are justified by faith without the works of the Law; but as certain that our faith must differ from *Abrahams*, even in the essentials of it: We must believe that *this Jesus is he, or we shall dye in our sins*; which *Abraham* was not required to believe. Our faith is an explicite Assent and Consent to the Mediators Offices, *viz.* that he be our Lord and Saviour, and a Covenanting with him, and giving up our selves to him accordingly: But whether *Abrahams* (and all recited in *Heb.* 11.) were such, is questionable. Too much looking on *Abraham* as a pattern, seems to be it that occasioned *Grotius* to give that wretched definition of faith, (*Annot. in loc.*) that [*it is but a high estimation of Gods power and wisdom, and faithfulness in keeping his promises, &c.*] (yet I know he came short also of describing that faith which he lookt on as the pattern.)

My first answer was that *I exclude also any effective co operation*: to which you say, [*Why do we strive about words*, &c.] I see that mens conceivings are so various, that there is no hopes that we should be in all things of one mind. Because I was loth

to strive about words, therefore I distinguished between *causality*, and *conditionality*, knowing that the word *By* was ambiguous (when we are said to be justified By faith *&c.* now you take this distinguishing to be striving about words, to avoid which, you would bring we back to the ambiguous term again. Whereas I cannot but be most confident that as guile is most in Generals, so there would be nothing else between us but striving about words, if we dispute on an unexplained term, and without distinction. Do you indeed think, that to be an efficient cause of our justification, and to be a bare condition, is all one? or do you think the difference to be of no moment? You say, *I do not exclude Works justifying as well as faith, let the expressions be what they will.* | *Answ.* 1. You should have said, [*Let the sense, or way of justifying be what it will,*] for sure the difference between an efficient cause and a condition is more then in the expression, or else I have been long mistaken. 2. I do not exclude *God justifying, Christ justifying, the Word justifying, &c.* and yet to distinguish between the way that these justifie in, and the way in which faith justifies, I take to be no striving about words, but of as high concernment as my salvation is worth. 3. Either you mislike my *phrase*, or my *sense*: if the *phrase*, then you mislike the *word of God*, which saith, *a man is justified by works and not by faith only*; If the *sense*, then you should not fall upon the *phrase*: and then to distinguish and explain, is not to strive about words. 4. If I do bring faith and obedience neerer in justification then others, it is not by giving *more to works* then others, but by giving *less to faith*; And if in that I err, you should have fallen on that and shewed it, and not speak still as if I gave more to works then you. I am sure I give *less to man*, and therefore *no less then you to Christ*. I perceive not the least disadvantage herein that I lye open to, but only the *odium* of the phrase of *justification by works*, with men that are carried by prejudice and custome. 5. I will not quarrel about such a word; but I like not your phrase of [*Faith justifying, and works justifying,*] for it is fitter to introduce the conceit of an efficiency in them, then to say, [*We are justified by faith and by Works*] which are only the Scripture phrase, and signifie but a conditionality.

To

To that you say out of *Phil.* 3. 9. I believe *Paul* doth most appositely oppose the righteousness which is by faith to that which is by the Law. But then 1. He means not [By faith as an instrument of justification] 2. Nor by faith which is but a meer reliance on Christ for justification, or only as such. 3. Nor doth he exclude Knowledge, Repentance, Obedience, *&c.* 4. But to say that righteousness or justification is *by love*, or *by obedience*, *&c.* Without adding any more, is not a convenient speech, as it is to say that righteousness is by faith. 1. Because the speech seems to be of the first receiving of righteousness, wherein obedience or works have no hand. 2. Because faith having most clear direct relation to Christ, doth most plainly point out our righteousness to be in him. 3. Because faith as it is taken in the Gospel, is a most comprehensive grace containing many acts, and implying or including many others which relate to Christ as the object also. Even obedience to Christ is implyed as a necessary subsequent part of the condition, seeing faith is an accepting of Christ as Lord and King, and Head, and Husband, as well as a justifier. 5. Yet Scripture saith as well as I, that Christ shall justifie us *By his knowledge*, and we shall be *justified by our words, and by works*; and me thinks it should be no sin to speak the words of God, except it be shewed that I misunderstand them. It is not so fit a phrase, to say, that a poor ignoble woman, was made rich and honorable by her Love, or Obedience, or Marriage, faithfulness, and conjugal actions, as to say, it was by marriage with such a Noble man, or consent to take him to be her husband: For the marriage consent and Covenant doth imply conjugal affection, action and faithfulness. Yet are these last as flat conditions of her continuing her enjoyments as the marriage Covenant was of first obtaining them.

To my second Answer, you shew that *Paul* excludes works under any notion. 1. From his opposition between faith and works, where you say I contradict *Paul*, and give a *tertium*. To which I answer, to distinguish of *Pauls* terms, and explain his meaning in his own words is not to give a *tertium*, or contradict; but this is all that I do. I distinguish of the word *Works*; sometime it is taken more largely for *Acts or Actions*,

and so *James* takes it: sometimes more strictly for only such *Actions as a Labourer performeth for his Wages*, or which *make the Reward to be not of Grace, but of debt*. So *Paul* tells you that he understandeth or useth the term, *Rom.* 4.4. usually therefore calling them *Works of the Law*. Now he that excludes Works only under *this* notion, doth not therefore exclude them under every notion. Where you add that Pauls *opposition is between Faith and any thing of ours*: I answer. 1. Is not Faith *ours* as much as Love, *&c*? 2. Are not *Knowledge*, *Words*, *Works*, *ours*, by all which God saith, we are justified? 3. There is no such Scripture where *Paul* makes any such opposition: but only he renounceth his own Righteousness which is of the Law, *Phil.* 3. 8,9. and any thing of our own that may be called *Works* in the stricter sence.

Your second is, *because* Paul *excludes* Abrahams *Works*, *&c.* Answer. 1. You make my *tertium* to be [*works that are of Grace*] and here again, *works that flow from Grace*, and say, Abrahams *were not by meer strength of the Law*: But these are no words of mine; nor is it candid to feign them to be mine; but that I impute it to your haste: I believe you remembred so well the words of *Andradius*, *Bellarmine*, and other Papists, that they dropped from your pen in haste in stead of mine; nor is my sence any whit like theirs; for I speak not of the efficient cause of works, (Nature or Grace) nor the meer command requiring them, when I speak of Law and Gospel: but the full entire Covenant or Law consisting of all its parts, and so making our Acts the conditions of the Punishment or Reward: as I have opened over and over in my Book. 2. You ask, *Were* Abrahams *Works in opposition to that*, *&c*? Answer. 1. *Paul* excludes also works in co-ordination with Christ, and so do I. 2. Yea and works supposed to be subordinate to Christ, which are not capable of a real subordination, 3. but not such as are truly subordinate, from being such conditions as is before said. 4 You seem to me to mistake *Paul* much, as if he took it for granted, that *Abraham* had such works which *Paul* disputeth against, but could not be justified by them: Whereas I doubt not to say, that *Paul* contrarily supposeth that *Abraham* had no such Works, (which make the reward to be of Debt, and

not

not of Grace) and therefore could not be justified by them.

Your third Argument is, [*because imputing, covering, all is wholly attributed to God.*] *Answer*, I doubt not but that God is the only Principal efficient Cause, and his Promise or Covenant the Instrumental: therefore I cannot think as others, that man is the efficient Instrumental by believing, or that Faith is such: But what! Is all therefore attributed to God? Even the performance of the Conditions on mans part? Or are there no such conditions which man must perform himself or perish? God only covereth sin, impureth Righteousness, *&c.* but to none who have not performed the Conditions. Is Believing attributed to God, or is it an act of man? Or is it excluded? When will you prove the Consequence of this Argument?

Your fifth Argument is, [*because the Assertion is universal without works in general*] *Answer*, 1. Doth not the Apostle contradict you by expounding himself in the very next verse before those you cite? *Rom.* 4. 4. That by works he means not simply *good actions*, as *James* doth, but such as make the reward to be of debt and not of Grace? Indeed such works are universally excluded. 2. Therefore he excludes the very *presence* of works, and saith, *to him that Worketh not*, &c. *ver.* 5. But the *presence* of good actions you say is not excluded.

Your last Argument seems to me the same with the fourth, and it forceth me to admire that you should think the consequence good. *Blessedness is when sin is forgiven; therefore no Work or good act performed by man is the condition of forgiveness, either as begun or continued, or consummate*] If this be not your consequence, you say nothing against me: if it be, I assure you it is not in my Power to believe it, nor to discern the least shaddow of probability of truth in it, nor to free it from the charge of being the grossest Antinomianism (*si pace tui ita dicam.*) And here I must needs tell you also my utter disability to reconcile you with your self; for you before say, they are *media ordinata*, and here you say, *They are excluded under any notion*: As if to be a *medium* were *no notion*; or the *medium* did nothing in or to the very justifying of the person.

To my next Answer. *If works be excluded under any notion, then* James *his Words cannot be true, that We are justified by works.*

You

You reply, *If there be justifying works, how saith* Paul *true?* I answer. This is a most evident *Petitio principii.* It is undeniable that *James* includeth works under some notion: and that *Paul* excludeth them under some other notion: now therefore I might well ask, *How saith* James *true else?* Because my supposition cannot be denyed: But you suppose that *Paul* excludeth works under any notion, (which is the very Question, and is denyed.) When you ask *how saith* Paul *true? Paul* saith true because he speaks of works strictly taken, as is by himself explained: *James* could not say true, if works under every notion (as you say) be excluded.

Next you come to reconcile them by expounding *James*; where you say, *Faith which in respect of its Act* ad intra, *only justifies, yet it works* ad extra: *fides quæ viva, non qua viva.* I answer. Whats this to the Question? The Question is not whether Faith work? Nor whether Faith justifie? Nor what Faith justifieth? But in what sence *James* saith, we are justified by works, and not by Faith only? You answer by a direct contradiction to *James*, (if I can reach the sence of your Answer) saying, *It is by Faith only, and that not as it liveth, &c.* So dare not I directly say, *it is not by works*, when God saith *it is*: but think I am bound to distinguish, and shew in what sence works justifie, and in what not; and not to say flatly against God, *that we are not justified by works under any notion*, but only by the Faith which worketh. A denyal of Gods Assertions is an ill expounding of them.

To what you say of the judgement of the Orthodox, [*that they go eadem via etsi non eadem semita*] I answer, you may understand your distinction as you please, but I have shewed the difference: some understand it of justification before God; others before men, *&c.* And if you please to make the way wide enough, you may take me among the Orthodox, that go *eadem via*: if not, I will stand out with *James.*

When you say [*they exclude works under any notion in the act of justification.*] I answer, 1. Your self include them as antecedents and concomitants (though I do not,) 2. I have shewed before that [*in the act, &c.*] is ambiguous. If you mean [*as Agents or Causes*], so do I exclude them. If you mean [*as conditions*

conditions required by the new Law to the continuing and consummating our justification] I have shewed you that Divines do judge otherwise.

My next answer was [*If Works under any notion be excluded, then faith is excluded*] You reply 1. [*Thus Bellarmine, &c.*] *Answ.* I knew indeed that *Bellarmine* saith so But Sir, you speak to one that is very neer Gods tribunal and therefore is resolved to look after naked truth, and not to be affrighted from it by the name either of *Bellarmine* or *Antichrist*; and who is at last brought to wink at prejudice. I am fully resolved by Gods grace to go on in the way of God as he discovereth it to me, and not to turn out of it when *Bellarmine* stands in it. Though the Divels believe, I will (by Gods help) believe too: and not deny Christ, because the Divels confess him. You say, *Non sequitur*, I prove the consequence. If all works (or acts) be excluded under any notion whatsoever, and if faith be a work or act then faith is excluded. But, &c. *Ergo*, &c. By the reason of your denyal I understand nothing that you *deny*, but [*that faith is a work or act*] which I never heard denyed before, and I hope never shall do again. The common answer to *Bellarmine* is, that *faith which is a work justifieth, but not as it is a work:* Which answer I confess to be sound, and subscribe to it. But then according to that, faith which is a work justifieth under some notion (suppose it were under the notion of an instrument) though not under the notion of a work. But you go another way, and say, 1. *Faith is passive in its instrumentality, and though to believe, be a grammatical action, its* verbum activum, *yet its physicè, or huper physicè passive. A man by believing doth not* operari, *but* recipere. *As* videre, audire, *are Grammatical actions, but physical or natural passions, &c.* Answer. 1. These are very sublime Assertions, quite past the reach of my capacity, and of all theirs that I use to converse with; and I dare say it is no Heresie to deny them, nor can that point be neer the foundation that stands upon such props which few men can apprehend. 2. What if Faith were *passive in its Instrumentality*? Is it not at all an *Act* therefore? If it be; Then that which is an *Act* or *Work*, is not excluded under the notion *of a passive Instrument*; and so

not under *every notion* (I speak on your grounds. But) because you told me before that I should have spent my self against this Instrumentality of Faith if I would hit the mark; I will speak the more largely to it now: And 1. Enquire whether *videre*, *audire*, be only Grammatical Actions (as you call them) and natural passions? 2. Whether Believing be so, only *verbum activum*, but Physically passive? And so to Believe, is not *agere*, but *pati* or *recipere*? 3. Whether faith be passive in its Instrumentality? 4. Whether the same may not be said as truly of other Graces? 5. Whether Faith be any proper Instrument of our Justification? 6. If it were, Whether that be the primary, formal Reason of its justifying vertue? 7. Whether your Opinion or mine be the plainer or safer?

And for the first, I should not think it worth the looking after, but that I perceive you lay much upon it, and that Philosophers generally suppose that the Sence and Intellect in this are alike; and for ought I discern, it is such a Passiveness of the Intellect that you intend: and therefore we may put all together, and enquire whether *videre & intelligere* be only Passions? And here you know how ill Philosophers are agreed among themselves, and therefore how slippery a ground this is for a man to build his Faith upon in so high point as this in hand: you know also that *Hippocrates*, *Galen*, *Plato*, *Plotinus*, with the generality of the *Platonists* are directly contrary to you: you know also that *Albertus Magnus*, and his followers judge sensation to be an action, though they take the *potentia* to be passive. You know also that *Aquinas* with his followers judge the very *potentia* to be active as well as passive; *passive* while it *receiveth the species*; and *active*, *Dum per ipsam agit & sensationem producit.* And *Tolet* saith, that this is Scotus *his sentence*, 2. *de Anima. q.* 12. *& Capreol. & ferè communis.* I know *Aquinas* saith, that *intelligere est quoddam pati*; but he taketh *pati* in his third wide improper sense, as *omne quod exit de potentia in actum, potest dici pati*: 1. q. 79 a. 2. C. And no doubt every second cause may be said to suffer even in its acting, as it receiveth the Influx from the first, which causeth it to act; but it will not thence follow that the *to videre*, *intelligere est formaliter pati*:

I

I cannot think that you deny the *intellectum agentem*: and you know that generally Philosophers attribute Action to the *possible Intellect*: and that *Jandun. Apollina, &c.* do accordingly make an *Agent and patient sence*: and if the reception of the *species* were *formaliter visio & intellectio* (which I believe not) yet how hardly is it proved that the Organ and Intellect are only passive in that reception? Yea how great a controversie is it what the sensible and intelligible *species* are? Yea and whether there be any such thing? Whether they be an image or similitude begotten or caused by the Object, as *Combacchius* and most? which yet *Suarez, &c.* denyeth. And whether they stick in the air, and have all their Being first there, as *Magyrus*, and other *Peripatetick*s? Or whether their Being is only in the eye? as some later. Or whether it be Sir *Ken. Digbyes* Atomes or number of small bodies which are in perpetual motion? I doubt not you know that *Ockam* and *Henricus quodlib. 4. q. 4.* reject all *species* as vain, and make the Intellect the only active proper cause of intellection. And *Hobs* of late in his book of humane Nature saith, *that visible and intelligible* species, *is the greatest Paradox in the world, as being a plain Impossibility.* And indeed it is somewhat strange that every stone and clod should be in perpetual Action, sending forth that which we call its *species*; for doubtless it sendeth forth as much when we behold it not as when we do. And more strange that a Rock or Mountain should be so active a creature, and so forcible in action, as to send forth its *species* so many miles! Yea, according to this Doctrine, many 1000 miles: for if our Organ were capable, we should see it so far. Whether the Angels see these things on earth *recipiendo species*, or not; sure according to this Doctrine, the *species* must reach as far as Heaven. And why do not stones wast by such an uncessant emanation? And it is strange to conceive how the Air is bepainted with variety of *species*, if this be true! that every Grass, Flower, Tree, Bird, Stone, *&c.* and other bodies, have their several distinct *species* in the Air night and day? How strangely is it painted? What room is there for them all, without confusion, If both color, quantity, odor, and all be there? And its strange if we do not hear the sound nor taste the sweetness, *&c.* but only the *spe-*

cies of them ! and beyond my Capacity how we ſhould diſcern *Diſtance* as well as the *Object diſtant* according to the paſſive opinion ! and more hard is it for me to believe this Doctrine, when I conſider how *Cats* and *Owls* ſee in the night : and how a man in a deep ſtudy, or that ſleepeth with his eyes open, ſeeth not any thing diſtinctly (though I know the frivolous anſwers to theſe :) And yet more hardly do I believe it when I feel *quanto labore & conatu* I muſt ſee to read a ſmall print, or diſcern a thing afar off : but above all when I feel the labor of my ſtudies, I hardly believe that my underſtanding is not active ; though I eaſily believe that I am alſo too paſſive. Why do I not underſtand with every dull thought ? To believe alſo that every ſtone is ſtill active, and that the eye and Intellect of the living Creature is but paſſive, is hard to me ; becauſe me thinks Action better agreeth to the living, then the inanimate. And yet the leſs do I aſſent when I obſerve what ſtreſs they lay upon the ſimilitude of a looking-glaſs receiving the *ſpecies*, which I am very confident it did never receive, when I ſee it moving as my eye moveth, and withdrawing when I withdraw, (though the Object be any ſtone or other immovable thing) I judge that when I am gone, the glaſs receiveth no more *ſpecies* from the wall, then the wall from the glaſs ; nor that the water receives any more *ſpecies* of the Moon that there appears, then the earth doth ; but that all is in mine eyes by the help of that reflection. I doubt not but you have read *D'Orbellis* arguments, (*Diſt.* 3. *in* 1. *ſent. par.* 3. *q.* 2.) againſt both extreams in point of *intellection* : Againſt yours his reaſons ſeem to me ſtrong : *Quia effectus æquivocus non poteſt excellere in perfectione cauſam æquivocam totalem ſed deficit neceſſario ab ea ; ſed intellectio eſſet effectus æquivocus ſpeciei intelligibilis, ſi ab ea ſola cauſaretur, & ita eſſet ſimpliciter imperfectior ſpecie intelligibili, quod non eſt verum. Tum etiam quia tunc non poſſet ſalvari imago in mente, ut mens eſt : quia nihil ipſius mentis haberet rationem parentis. Item quomodo cauſarentur relationes rationis, ſive intentiones logicæ, quæ ſunt in actu collativo ? cum illa intentio dicatur realis quæ cauſatur immediate à re vel ſpecie repreſentante rem in ſe.* Even *des Cartes* his Doctrine of vibration ſeemeth to make the ſenſation and intellection to be formally Action, though the Organ muſt firſt be paſſive to the producing it, before it be Active.

Active. *Zabarel, Combacchius, &c.* say that in sensation there is first a receiving the *species*. 2. A judging, *&c.* The first by the Organ which is passive, and the later (which is the very sensation) by the sensitive soul, which is active. Therefore *Combacchius* saith, *Intellectio est operatio animæ rationalis, &c.* but *passio* is not *operatio*. *Schibler* determineth it (*Top. p.* 232. that the object doth but 1. *Excitare potentias Activas ad actus.* 2. *Terminare actus. Viguerius Institut. p.* 261. besides the intellect Agent, ascribeth to the Possible three offices. 1. To draw and receive the *species*. 2. Actually to understand. 3. To conserve the *species*. The same *Viguerius, instit. p.* 17. *& Aquin. 1. q.* 18. *a.* 3. 1. *Suarez Tom.* 2. *disp* 48. §. 6. *Scaliger Exercit.* 307. *s.* 2. as also *Bradwardine, Scotus, Cajetani ambo, Albert: D'Orbellis, Ruvio, Alstedius, Keckerman Stierius, Zanchius, Burgersdicius, A. C. fascic. log. Prideaux Hypomnem.* with many more, have taught me to account vision, intellection, and volition for Immanent Acts. And though there be a reception of the *species*, and so somewhat of passion as well as of action, yet that of passion is but a preparation or *quasi materiale*, and the *formale* is in action, as *Keckerman, Syst. log. p.* 110. *Physici nonnulli discernunt materiale & formale: sic materiale in visu est receptio specierum visibilium in oculo, quæ est passio: est deinde dijudicatio rei visibilis per illas species quæ est actio: hinc est quod Aristot. sensum modo ad actionem, modo ad passionem refert. Zanchius* saith, Vol. 1. T. 3. p. 581. *Vim omnem sensitivam esse partim passivum, partim activum, diversis respectibus: Passiva est quatenus, percipit objecta. Activa est quatenus ipsa ab objecto afficitur, parit sensum, & rem unam ab alio discernit, Potentia enim visiva postquam recepit coloris albi speciem, discernit hanc à nigro, &c. sic in rebus Divinis vis nostræ mentis & voluntatis & passiva & activa est. Passiva quatenus recipit gratiam à Deo in nobis operante: Activa vero quatenus affecta Dei gratia, ipsa Credit, ipsa Amat; Acti enim Agimur.* Res sua natura intelligibiles vis hæc animæ *Patiens intellectus* appellata, efficit suo lumine, suaque *Actione, ut res actu intelligantur. Hoc lumen intellectus Agentis, hoc est, animæ nostræ, non minima pars est imaginis Dei in qua creati sumus. Obscurata fuit lux nobis communicata per peccatum Adæ,*

sed illustratur denuo per Christum: unde hac nova luce Deum Deique mysteria intelligimus, quæ certe animalis homo percipere non potest. Proinde cum essemus tenebræ, denuo facti sumus & vocamur lux in Domino. Ex hac nova luce donata per Christum, intelligimus quid sit intellectus Agens. Zanch. ibid. p. 596. You see how far *Zanchius* Philosophy and Divinity is from yours: so *p.* 594. *Est autem manifesta in nobis hæc intellectus Actio, nempe intelligere. Et pag.* 638. He saith the intellect hath *four operations.* 1. *Simplicium apprehensio.* 2. *Horum Compositio.* 3. *Compositorum æstimatio, eoque & verorum à falsis divisio.* 4. *Ex his ratiocinatio.* And you know that *Tolet*, having formerly thought, with *Ægid. Paul. Venet. & Cajet.* that *sensatio (& ita intellectio) est formaliter passio*, did change his judgement, and at last conclude that *Visio vel sensatio alia duos motus dicit: unum materialiter, & hic est receptio speciei: alterum formaliter, & hic est Actio: Prior inest Organo ratione materiæ: posterior ratione potentiæ, & animæ: tamen uterque eidem inest Organo. Prior quidem non est substantialiter & essentialiter sensatio, sed concomitans & velut dispositio: posterior est essentialiter sensatio.*

But I have been too tedious on this. *vid. ultra in l. 2. de Anima, p. 76, 77. &c. & l. 3. q. 13. &c.* You see my reasons in part why I may think my self excusable, though I build not an Article of my faith on your Philosophical assertion; [*that videre, audire, (and so to believe) are Grammatical actions (only)* (for you must say [*only*] or you say nothing) and but physical passions. *Quest. 2. Whether to Believe be only* verbum activum *? but physically passive, and a man by believing doth not* operari, *but* recipere.

This Question comes a little closer. By *operari* I know you mean *agere*: for if you should mean such an *operation* as *Operarius pro mercede ex debito* performeth, then you should say nothing, but dispute against what I disavowed, even in the letter you answer (which I dare not impute to you) Now the reasons that force me to differ vehemently from you (as you said to me) in this point, are partly Philosophical, partly Theological. And 1. I would fain know what that is which you here call *Faith*, and say *its passive?* Is it the Habit? No: For 1. That cannot be passive. 2. That is not it that justifieth. 3. That is not a passion, as you say this is. 4. That is not a *Grammatical Action*

Action, as you say this is; What then! Is it the *Act of Faith?* No: For 1. Thats it that you are denying, and say its but *verbum activum.* 2. You say, *it is passive.* But how an *Action* can be *passive*, is so far beyond the reach of my weak understanding, that I could not believe it, though it were judged Heresie to deny it. *Passio intrinsecum ordinem dicit ad subjectum, & repugnat dari passionem extra subjectum*, saith *Suirez: Tom.* 2. *disp.* 49. *p.* 451. And that *Action* can be the subject of *Passion*, is Philosophy that I never learned, and I think never shall do. Especially if *Schibler* and most Philosophers say true that *Actio & passio non differunt realiter sed secundum inadæquatos conceptus.* For very many have taught me, that to the Peripateticks it is absurd for the same to be both the Action, *Passion* and *Passum*; yea to common reason it is ——

Most certainly therefore it is neither *Habit*, nor *Act* of faith which you call faith. What is it then? Is it a *Passion?* So you say your self, and therefore I must take that to be your meaning: And I cannot imagine what else you should call faith. But here you leave me at as great a loss as before. For, 1. You say it is *Passive:* But I never heard or read before of a *Passive Passion*, any more then of a *Passive Action*: And if I should set my understanding on the wrack, it would not apprehend or acknowledge any such thing. I cannot imagine that it is the soul it self which you say is *passive.* 1. Because you say it is *faith.* 2. Because else your Argument must conclude that the soul only is the instrument: But we are not questioning the instrumentality of the soul now, but of faith. More I might urge to shew that this cannot be your meaning, but that I will not suppose that it is the soul it self which you call *faith.* It being therefore neither the *Soul*, *Habit*, *Act*, nor *Passion* which you here say is *Passive in its instrumentality*, I am forced to confess I know not what you mean: Yet if you should mean any *Potentia Passiva.* 1. Whether there be any such in the rational soul distinct from the soul it self, is a great doubt. 2. If there were, I know not how it can be called *faith.* 3. Nor is it such a *Potentia* that is the instrument of justification. Yet afterwards you say, It is an act of dependance, which here you call a *Passion.*

2. But whether *Act* or *Passion*, it must belong either to the

Under-

Understanding, or *Will*, or *both*: And 1. If you should place it only in the understanding, you would (besides Dr. *Downam*) have few but the Papists with you. 2. If in the Will only, then (as Scripture is most plain against it, so) you would also go against the generality of our Divines *Melancthon Jo. Crocius*, *Amesius*, *Davenant*, *&c.* make it the common Protestant Tenet, that it is in both. *In actu fidei Justificantis tota anima se convertit ad causam justificantem*: Davenant, Determ. Q. 38. *pag.* 174. *Fides illa quam Scriptura justificantem agnoscit, habet in se complicatum actum voluntatis & intellectus.* idem. ibid. Q. 37. *pag.* 166. And to them that think it absurd to have it in both faculties, I answer with the same Author. 1. *Quod philosophantur voluntatem & intellectum esse duas potentias re ipsa distinctas, dogma philosophicum est ab omnibus haud receptum*, (not of *Scotus* and his followers, with many more) *& Theologicis dogmatibus firmandis aut infirmandis fundamentū minime idoneum.* 2. *Neq; nobis absurdum, sed valde consentaneum videtur, actum illum quo tota anima purificatur & justificatur, ad totam animam pertinere: ita ut in nudo intellectu habeat initium, in voluntate complementum. Idem. ibid.*

3. If you say it is in *both* (as I doubt not but you will, it being the plain Truth) then 1. It cannot possibly be any one single *Act* or *Passion* which you call the *passive Instrument*: and do you think to find out *many* such? 2. For that which belongeth to the understanding, it must be either a *simple apprehension*, a *composition or division*, *or a ratiocination or Judgement*. And 1. A simple Apprehension it cannot be: 1. For so the Intellect receiveth all Objects alike. It receiveth sin, death, unrighteousness, Satan, hell in the same kind as it receiveth Grace, Life, Righteousness, Christ, Heaven. For it *understandeth* both in the same way, receiving them *per modum objecti*. 2. And thus it receiveth not the *very thing* it self Essentially, (though it *understand* the thing it self) but only as is said, the *species* or action of it, *&c.* (except you will say as Sir *Ken. Digby*, and the Lord *Brook*, that the thing understood is really in the understanding, and become one with it) Now according to this sence, you would not make faith to receive Christ or his Righteousness atall, but only the *species* or *Idea* of them. 3. And how oft

hath

hath *Bellarmine* been called Sophister for supposing, we mean such an apprehension ? Therefore I will not dare to think that you mean this. 4. And if you did, yet I have shewed how uncertain it is, that this *intelligere* is *only* or *formally pati*. 2. But if you mean not this *simple apprehension* (as sure you do not) then how is it possible to imagine the understanding should be *passive* in it ? Did ever man that writ of Philosophy once think that the soul did *componere, dividere, ratiocinari, judicare, patiendo & non agendo* ? I think no man. When *Tolet* disputeth *utrum intelligere sit pati* ? he saith, *Adverterdum est quod sermo est de apprehensione ; nam de compositione & judicio non est dubium apud omnes*. Tol. *de anima. p.* 166. I will not therefore suppose you to differ in your Philosophy from all men. What Act of the understanding you will make to be part of Justifying faith, I know not : For I find Divines are very little agreed in it : But the most make Assent to be the only Act of the understanding (though some add *notitia*) and of them some make it *Essential* to justifying Faith : and others but as a common prerequisite Act. Now if it were *Assensus Noeticus*, yet it is impossible it should be formally a Passion : but much more impossible when it is *Assensus dianoeticus vel discursivus*, as is most evident it is, and our judicious *Rob. Baronius* truly teacheth, *Philos. Theol. Ancil. Exerc.* 3. *Art.* 16.

Most Divines place the chief Essence of Faith in *fiducia* : but then they are as ill agreed what to mean by *fiducia*. *Pemble* would fain perswade us that to Believe the Truth of a particular Promise, is to trust on the performance of it to me; and that the *Assent* of Faith which is given to such a Promise, is properly called *fiducia* or *Trust*. But this is grounded on his singular opinion, that *Truth* and *Goodness* are all one, *&c. Baronius, pag.* 232. tels us of a four-fold *fiducia* : The first he makes to be but a confident Assent to the Truth of the Promise, and a firm sure Perswasion of the Remission of my own sins and of my Salvation. The second is a Resting on Gods Goodness alone, *&c.* He placeth the justifying vertue only in the first, which yet containeth but partly Assent (which we plead against the Papists usually not to be the justifying Act) and partly a particular Perswasion or Belief of Pardon, which is properly no

Faith, but that commonly called Assurance. Now this kind of *fiducia* is but the Assent we have spoken of, and is beyond all dispute no meer *Passion*, but an *Act* of the Understanding.

2. But most Divines make that *fiducia* which is an act of the *Will* to have the chief hand in this work of justifying: though *Baronius* is so confident that it is not an act of Faith, but an Effect and Consequent, that he takes it for a thing so manifest, that it needeth no proof, *p.* 234. And Dr. *Downam* hath brought not a few, nor contemptible Arguments to the same purpose against *Pemble*, *Append.* to Covennat of *Gr.* Yet though we have found it in the Will, yet it is hard to find what act of the Will they mean. If it be an *Elicit Act*, it must first either respect the *End*, and then it is either *velle intendere vel frui*: But sure *fiducia* is none of these: and if it were, it is more sure that at least the two first are not *Passions*; and I think not the last, though it be nothing to the present point: Or else 2. It must respect the *Means*; and then it must be *Eligere*, *Consentire vel Uti* (in which joined to *Assent*, I take justifying Faith to consist): But it is both evident that none of these is *fiducia*, and if they were, that none of these are *passions* or *passive*. So that hitherto we are to seek for this Passive Faith.

Or else it is an *Imparate* Act; and then we are in a wood to seek among so many that there is little hope of finding it. The Truth seems to me to be beyond dispute, that *fiducia* is no one single Act (though one word) but a composition of many implying or containing the *Assent* of the understanding, the *Election* of the Will, especially much of *Hope* and *Adventurousness* in the Irascible of the Sensitive, together with a suspension of some acts. And if we are justified by this *Recumbency* or *Fiducia*, I shall believe we are justified as well by *Hope* as any thing; for that takes up most here, as *Dr.* Downam *ubi supra* proveth. And who ever said that in all or any of these the Soul *is Passive and not Active*? Indeed *Hope* and *Venturousness* are *Passions*, but in another sense (as *Keckerm.* and *Tolet ubi supra* have well opened; its in respect of their *quasi materiale.*) I am content to stand or fall by the vote of Philosophers, giving you 100 to one, whether the *Formality of these motions*

of

of the Will lie in Passion or Action? And if they are *Acts*, *Whether they can be the Subjects of Passion; and so be passive Acts?* So that yet I cannot find out your passive Faith.

3. But yet further, if Faith be passive Physically, let us find out first what is the *Agent?* 2. What the *Action?* 3. What the *Patient* or *Object?* 4. What is the *Terminus ad quem?*

1. I doubt not but it is agreed that the Agent is God: for it is he that justifieth. 2. The *terminus* or *res motus facta* is two-fold. 1. Justification *in sensu legis*, commonly called *constitutive Justification* (passive.) 2. *Publique Justification by plea and sentence at Judgement* (passive) 3. The Action must be therefore two-fold, or two Actions according to the two-fold *Terminus*. Yea in the former we may (if we accurately consider it) find out a two-fold *Action* and *Terminus*, though the difference be narrow: In which we are to consider, 1. Of the Instrument. 2. And the nature of the Actions. 1. The Instrument is the word of Promise or Grant in the Gospel (for if you know any other way of Gods justifying, or any immediate Act of God herein which is Transient, I would it were revealed what Act it is.) Herein I have Mr. *Rutherford* saying as I, over and over against the *Antinomians*. 2. The Action therefore can be no other then a moral Action, as a Lease or Bond, or written-Law may be said to act. Now the Gospel performeth to our first Justification a two-fold Action. 1. It doth as a Deed of Gift bestow Christ and his Merits on men, so it be they will Believe. This Action doth not immediately and directly constitute them Righteous: for Righteousness being a Relation, must have its Foundation first laid: This Act therefore of Donation (which some call Imputation) doth directly lay the *Fundamentum*, whence the Relation of Righteous doth immediately arise (when the Condition is peformed) *per nudam resultantiam* without any other Act to produce it. And this is most properly called *Justificatio constitutiva activa*. 2. When the Gospel hath by Gift constituted us Righteous, then next in order it doth declare or pronounce us Righteous, and vertually acquit us from Condemnation. This is by the like silent moral interpretative Action only as the other. (And per-

haps may be most fitly called the imputing of Righteousness, or esteeming us Righteous, as *Piscator.*) And for the latter Justification at Judgement, the Action is Christs publique pleading, and sentencing us Acquitt: which is an Action both Physical and Moral in several respects. 4. Now if we enquire after the Patient, or rather the Object of these several Acts, we shall quckly find that the Man is that Object; but that Faith is any Patient here, is past my apprehension. For the first Act of God by the Gospel [giving Christ and his Merit to us,] it is only a moral Action: (Though the writting and speaking the Word at first was a Physical action, yet the Word or Promise now doth *moraliter tantùm agere*:) And therefore it is impossible that Faith should be Physically passive from it. For Passion being an effect of Action, it must be a Physical proper Action which produceth a physical Passion. I will not stand to make your Assertion odious here by enquiring what Physical effective Influx, Contact, *&c.* here is, which should manifest Faith to be physically Passive. I know in the Work of effectual vocation the Soul is first passive: but that is nothing to our Question, whether Faith be passive in Justification. Do but tell me plainly *quid patitur fides*, and you do the Business.

But what if you had only said that Faith is *morally passive*, and not *physically*? I answer. It had been less harsh to me, though not fit, nor to the point. For 1. Gods Justification nor Donation of Christ, is not properly of, or to Faith; for then Faith should be made righteous and justified hereby; but to the person, if he Believe. 2. Besides if you should confess only a moral Passiveness (which is somewhat an odd phrase and notion, and is but to be the Object of a moral Action) it would spoil all the common arguments drawn from the physical nature of Faith, and its sole excellency herein in apprehending, receiving, *&c.* and thereby justifying. And you would bring in all other Graces to which the same Promise may as well be said to be made. 3. The Truth I have and further shall manifest to be this; that as it is not to faith or any other act that Righteousness is given, but to the person on condition he Believe; so this condition is no passion but an action, or di-

vers

vers actions. This will fully appear in the Theological Reasons following. In the mean time I need not stand on this, because you express your self that Faith is *physically passive*. Indeed you add [*or hyperphysically* :] but though I meet with some Philosophers, that use in such cases to give [*hyperphysice*] as a *tertium* to overthrow the sufficiency of the distinction of *physice & moraliter*, yet I suppose that is none of your meaning, who know that even *Intellectus dum efficit intellectionem, & voluntas volitionem, sunt causæ physicæ, ut* Suarez, 1. *Tom. disp.* 17. §. 2. *p.* 260. and so *Schibler*, and many more: yea and that our Divines conclude that Gods action on our souls in conversion is first Physical: which yet may be as truly and fully called hyperphysical as our Faith.

Now for the second action of the Gospel, [*declaring or pronouncing the Believer righteous, and so* de jure *acquitting him* ;] It is much more beyond my reach to conceive how faith can in respect of it be passive: For 1. Besides that it is a moral action as the former, and so cannot of it self produce a physical passion. 2. It doth not therein speak of or to faith, pronouncing it just, and acquitting it, but of and to the Believer. So that if Faith were physically passive in the former, yet here it is impossible. 3. If you say that it is physically (or morally) passive in regard of the latter full Justification by sentence at Judgement, you would transcend my capacity most of all. To say faith is the Patient of Christs judiciary publique sentence, is a sentence that shall never be an article of my Faith: and is so gross, that I conjecture you would take it ill if I should take it to be your meaning: therefore I will say no more against it. Now you know that this is (as you say in your *Lect.*) the most *compleat Justification*; and which I most stand upon: and therefore if your arguments fail in respect of this, they yield me almost all I expect.

Next I will tell you my Reasons Theological why I believe not that justifying faith, as such, is passive. 1. All Divines and the Scripture it self hath perswaded me, that Christ and the Promises are the Object of this Faith: but a Passion hath no Object, but a subject, *&c.* Therefore according to you Christ, *&c.*

is not the object of it; which is contrary to all that I have heard or read.

2. I have read Divines long contending *which is* the Act of justifying faith, *qua talis*. And some say one, and some another; but all say one, or other, or many. Now you cut the knot, and contradict all, in making it (at least *quatenus Justificans*) *no Act at all*, but a *Passion*: unless you will say it is a *passive act*, which I dare not imagine. And doubtless these Divines shew by their whole speech that by *Actus Fidei*, they mean *Actus secundus vel Actio*, and not *Actus primus vel entitativus vel accidentalis, sive ut informans, sive ut operativus, sed ipsa operatio*.

3. I am truly afraid lest by entertaining this opinion I should strike in not only with the *Antinomians* (who cannot endure to hear of any conditions of life of our performing, but even with the *Libertines*, who tell me to my face, that man is but Passive, and as the soul Acts the body, so Christ in them moveth the soul to Good, and Satan to evil, while they are meerly Passive, and therefore the Devil shall be damned for sin who committeth it in them, and not they; for who will bite the stone or beat the staff, or be angry at the sword? *&c.*

4. Else you must depress the excellent grace of faith below all other, in making it meerly Passive while others are active: For doubtless life and excellency is more in Action then Passion.

5. If believing be only suffering, then all Infidels are damned only for not suffering, which is horrid.

6. Scripture frequently condemneth wicked men for Action, for Rebellion, Refusing, Rejecting Christ, *Luke* 19. 27. They hate him and say, we will not have this man reign over us, *&c.* and this is their unbelief. If they resisted the Holy Ghost only *Passivè & non Activè*, then it would be only an *ineptitudo materiei*, which is in all alike at first, and so all should be alike rejecters.

7. If to believe be but *Pati*, then it is God and not man that should be perswaded: For perswasion is either to Action or forbearing Action; and God is the Agent: But it is in vain to perswade any to be Passive, except it be not to strive against

againſt it. This therefore would overthrow much of the uſe of the Miniſtry.

8. And then when Chriſt ſo extolleth *doing the Will of God*, and *doing his Commandments*, *&c.* you will exclude juſtifying faith, as being no *doing*.

9. Is it credible, that when Chriſt cals faith *Obeying the Goſpel*, and ſaith, *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom the father hath ſent*; and calls it the *work of faith*, 2 *Theſ.* 1. 11. and ſaith, *God giveth to will*, (that is, to believe) *and to do*, *&c.* that all this is meant of meer Paſſion? I undertake to bring forty places of Scripture that ſhew faith to be Action.

10. It ſeemeth to me ſo great a debaſing of faith, as to make it to be no vertue at all, nor to have any moral good in it. For though I have read of *Paſſio perfectiva in genere entis vel naturæ*, and conducible to vertue; Yet am I not convinced yet that any Paſſion as ſuch, hath any moral vertue in it. Indeed Paſſion may be the *quaſi materiale*, but the vertue is in Action. Yea, even in non-acting, (as ſilence) the vertue lies formally in the actual exerciſe of the Authority of Reaſon, and ſo obeying God in cauſing that ſilence. Sure if men ſhall be all judged according to their works, and according to what they have done, *&c.* then it will not be becauſe they did either *Pati vel non pati*. And thus you have ſome of my reaſons why I cannot believe that *Believing is paſſion*, nor ſhall believe it I think, till *Credere* be *Pati*, and then I may whether I will or no, becauſe *pati vel non pati* are not in my choice.

3. The third Queſtion is, *Whether faith be paſſive in its inſtrumentality?*

And I think that is out of doubt, if my former arguing have proved that faith is not paſſive at all: or if I next prove that faith is no *phyſical inſtrument*. But yet if I ſhould grant both that faith is *paſſive*, and that it is an *Inſtrument*, yet muſt I have either more or leſs Logick before I can believe that it is *paſſive in its inſtrumentality*.

My reaſons againſt it are theſe. 1. Every Inſtrumental cauſe is an efficient cauſe: but all true efficiency is by action: there-

therefore all instrumentality is by action. That *causalitas efficientis est Actio; & hæc est forma per quam denominatur efficiens; quia agens & efficiens sunt idem*, &c. I have been taught so oft and so confidently that I believe it, (For *oportet discentem credere*): and that by Philosophers of no mean esteem, as *Suarez Tom. 1. disp. 18. §. 10. Javel. Metaph. l. 9. q. 16. Conim. Colleg. Phys. l. 2. q. 6. art. 2. & 7. Scaliger. Exerit. 254. Aquinas, Ruvio, Porrece, Melanth. Zanchius, Zabarel, Pererius, Schibler, Stierius, Gu. Tempell. in Ram.* with many more. And if there be no such thing *in rerum natura* as a *Passive instrument*, then faith is none such. I know *Keckerm. Alsted. & Burgersdicius* do talk of a Passive instrument; but I think in proper speech it is a contradiction, in *adjecto*, and say as *Schibler Metaphys. l. 1. cap. 12. Tit. 7. p. 319. Nisi Actionem propriam haberet Instrumentum, efficiens non esset; & proinde passivum instrumentum quod Keckerm. vocat, revera instrumentum non est. Et ut Idem, Topic. cap. 2. num. 34. Instrumentum totum hoc habet quod ad causam efficientem adjuvantem (ad quam referimus causam instrumentalem) requiritur. Ratio enim communis illarum est hæc. Deservire operationi principalis agentis per ulteriorem operationem. Et Idem, Topic. cap. 2. num. 6. Quer. An efficientis Causalitas, Actio? Resp. Ita ponitur in Theor. 36. & sentit ita hodie Maxima pars Logicorum & Metaphysicorum. Vide ultra pro confirmatione ad nu. 9. Sic etiam cap. 3. num. 136.* So that if *most Logicians* judge that there is no passive instrument, and consequently that faith is no passive instrument, then who is more singular, you or I? For sure, *Nihil est falsum in Theologia, quod verum est in Philosophia.* I deny not but the soul in believing is both Passive and instrumental, but in several respects: as if *Camero's* way should hold of infusing grace into the will *Mediante actione intellectus*, then the intellect would be Passive or receiving grace into it self, and an *instrument* of conveying it to the will: but then it would be no Passive but an Active instrument: and the action of God on the Passive intellect, and of the intellect on the will, are two Actions with distinct effects.

2. Though there were such a thing in the world as a Passive instrument, yet that *faith* should be such, and that *physical*, I dare say is either an unfit assertion, or else I am of a stupid ap-

pre-

prehenſion. For there muſt be found in it (if it were ſuch) theſe four requiſites. 1. There muſt be a phyſical paſſion or reception. 2. A phyſical efficiency. 3. This efficiency muſt be *patiendo, non agendo.* 4. And it muſt be ſuch an efficiency as is proper to inſtruments. I may not ſtand to enquire exactly into all theſe. 1. The firſt I have confuted already, and ſhall add this much more. 1. What doth faith thus receive? 2. How doth it receive it? 3. Whence? Or from what Agent and Act? 1. Is it Chriſt himſelf that is phyſically received by faith? 1. Who dare ſay ſo, but the *Ubiquitarians*, and Tranſubſtantiation men? and perhaps not they. Chriſt is in Heaven, and we on earth. A multitude of blaſphemers, Libertines, and Familiſts, I lately meet with that dream of this, but no ſober man. 2. And indeed if Chriſts perſon were thus received, it would not make a man righteous, or juſtifie him. As all our Divines ſay, his being in the body of *Mary* would not have juſtified her: Nor did the kiſſing of his lips juſtifie *Judas*; nor eating and drinking in his preſence juſtifie thoſe that muſt depart from him for working iniquity, *Matthew* 7. If we had ſo known Chriſt, we ſhould know him no more: It was neceſſary to his Diſciples that he ſhould go from them; we muſt not have the *Capernaites* conceit of eating his fleſh. Yea, to talk of a *phyſical* receiving by faith, is far groſſer: For the mouth was capable of that phyſical contact, which faith is not. 3. And then this will not ſtand with their Judgement, that blame me for making Chriſt himſelf the object of juſtifying faith, and not the promiſe directly. 2. If you ſay that the thing received is Chriſts righteouſneſs, (as moſt do that I read) I anſwer, 1. Righteouſneſs is but a relation: And therefore a thing which is naturally uncapable of being of it ſelf phyſically apprehended. This is paſt doubt. 2. If it be phyſically received, then either as a principle and quality, or as an object. Not the former: For ſo we receive our firſt, (and after) grace in ſanctification; but none ever ſaid ſo in juſtification: Nor indeed can that righteouſneſs which is formally but a relation, dwel in us as a principle or quality. If we receive it as an object, then by an Act: Or if the ſoul were granted to be paſſive in reception of an object, I have ſhewed that, 1. It is but *in ap-*

prehensione simplici: None pleadeth for more: But faith is not such. 2. And so it would receive Christ no otherways then it receiveth any object whatsoever it thus apprehendeth. 3. And this is not to receive Christ or his righteousnes, but the meer species of it according to your own Philosophers, (and if righteousnes be but a relation; and a relation, as *Durandus*, *Dr. Twiss*, and many another think be but *Ens Rationis*, then the species of an *Ens Rationis* is a very curious Web) Knowledge (as *D'Orbellis* saith in 2. *sent. Dis.* 3. *q.* 3.) is twofold, *i. e. sensitive* and *intellective*; and each of these twofold, *Intuitive* and *Abstractive*. *Intuitive knowledge* is indeed *de objecto ut in se præsens*; *quando scilicet res in propria existentia est per se motiva*: *Exemplum de sensitiva est, ut visus videt colorem*: (yet this is but *Recipiendo speciem, non rem*) and this is not *it* in question): *Exemplum de intellectiva est, ut visio Divinæ essentiæ à beatis*: This is utterly denyed to be at all by Doctor *Stoughton*, *Camer.* and other solid Divines, against the School-mens judgement: And if it be, yet doubtless as we know not how, so it is not such as faiths apprehension, which we enquire after, *Cognitio Abstractiva est quando species rei movet ad cognoscendum rem ipsam, & hoc sive res sit in se præsens, sive absens, sive existat sive non*: *Exemplum in sensitiva est, ut phantasia imaginatur colorem*: *Exemplum in intellectiva est ut intellectus cognoscit quidditatem coloris medicante ejus specie*. So that if it be either of these, it were at the utmost but a passive reception of the species, and not of Christ or his righteousnes.

2. By what physical contact faith doth receive this? might be enquired: and 3. By what physical act of the Agent? to neither of which questions can I imagine what tolerable answer can be given, in defence of this cause.

2. And if faith be a passive *physical instrument*, it must have a *Physical Efficiency*? and what is that? to justifie? why, even God himself in this life doth that but by a Moral Act (by his word) and not by a physical, (as to particulars.)

3. But that which driveth me to the greatest admiration is, How faith should *Efficere patiendo*! If I should rip up this, or

or require a demonstration of it in respect to the justification at judgement, yea, or in this life, yea or of any effect, I should lay such an odium on it from its absurdities, that in dealing with you, modesty doth forbid me to insist on it. 4. The fourth requisite will be enquired after in the next Question save one.

The fourth Question is, *Whether other Graces may not be as properly called physical passive Instruments as Faith, in your sense?*

And I doubt not but they may, (though its true of neither) For 1. If there be no physical reception of Christs righteousness imaginable but that which is *per modum objecti*, and if other gratious acts have Christs righteousness for their object, as well as that which you call faith; then other Acts do receive Christs righteousness as well as faith: but both branches of the Antecedent are true, therefore the consequence, the bare knowledge or simple apprehension of Christs righteousness *per modum objecti* may better pretend to this, then recombency or affiance: Yea, and love it self more fitly then affiance may be said to receive or embrace its object (which is not therefore false neither because *Bellarmine* hath it: and you know he brings *Austines* plain words, affirming love to be the hand by which they received him, *&c.*) I confess if I first renounce not the concurrent Judgement of Philosophers, I cannot approve of the common Answer which our Divines give to *Bellarmine* in this, *viz.* [*That Faith receiveth Christs Righteousness first to make it ours, but Love only to retain it, and embrace and enjoy it when first we know it to be ours*:] For though this say as much as I need to plead for, acknowledging Love to be as properly a physical Reception for retention, as Faith is for first Possession, yet if affiance be taken in any proper ordinary sence, it cannot thus hold good neither: for so *Affiance* must signifie some act of the will in order of nature after love, or at least not before it. I acknowledge that so much of Faith as lyeth in the understanding is before Love in order of nature; *sicut ipse intellectus est simpliciter prior voluntate, ut motivum mobili, & activum passivo, ut* Aquin. 1. q. §. 2. a. 3. 2. *and* 12. q. 13. a. 1. C. For as he, *Intellectus est*

primum motivum omnium potentiarium animæ quoad determinationem actus, voluntas verò quoad exercitium actus, Aquin, 12. *q.* 17. *a.* 1. *C.* But for the acts of the will toward Christ, I could give you (but to avoid tediousness I must forbear) at large the Testimony of *Aquinas*, *Tolet*, *Gerson*, *Camero*, *Amesius*, *Zanchius*, *Rob. Baronius*, *Bradwardine*, *Ravio*, *Viguerius*, *&c.* That Love is not only the first of all the Passions, but even the first motion of the Will towards its Object, and little or not at all different from *Volition*, *diligere* being but *intensive velle*. I have much more to say to this, which here I must pretermit. But still I speak not of Love as a Pasion, but a true closure, as it were of the will with its Object as Good: and expect love to be proper to the sensitive, and strange to the intellective soul; we must make it the same with *Velle*: For *Amor & gaudium in quantum significant Actus appetitus sensitivi, passiones sunt; non autem secundum quod significant Actus appetitus intellectivi, inquit* Aquinas. 1. *q.* 2. *a.* 1. 1.

The fifth Question is, *Whether Faith be any Instrument of our Justification?*

Answer, *Scotus* gives many sences of the word *Instrument*, and so doth *Aquinas*, *Schibler*, and most Philosophers that meddle with it: and they give some so large, as contain all causes in the world under God the first cause; In so large a sence, if any will call faith an Instrument of Justification, I will not contend with him; though yet I will not say so my self, as judging faith to be no kind of cause of it at all; but in the proper ordinary sence, as an Instrument, signifieth *Causam quæ influit in effectum per virtutem inferioris rationis*, *as* Suarez, Stierius, Arnisæus, &c. *Vel Instrumentum est quod ex directione alterius principalis agentis influit ad producendum effectum se nobiliorem*, *ut* Schibler, *&c.* So I utterly deny Faith to be an Instrument. But I will first question whether it be a physical Instrument. 2. Whether a moral? 1. And for the first, I have done it already: for seeing our acute Divines have ceased to lay any claim to it as an *active* Instrument, but only as a *Passive*; therefore having disproved what they claim, I have done enough to that. 2. Yet I will add some more: And 1. If it be a physical active Instrument, it must have a physical active Influx to the

the producing of the Effect; but so hath not Faith to the producing of our Justification. *Ergo* &c. The Major is apparent from the common definition of such Instruments: The Minor will be as evident, if we consider but what Gods Act in Justification is, and then it would appear impossible that any act of ours should be such an Instrument. 1. At the great Justification at Judgement Christs act is to sentence us acquit and discharged: and doth our Faith *activè, sine influere ad hunc effectum*? Doth it intervene between Christ and the effect? and so actively justifie us? Who will say so? 2. And the act by which God justifieth us here, is by a Deed of Gift in his Gospel (as I Judge) Now 1. That doth immediately produce the effect (only supposing Faith as a condition.) 2. And it is but a moral Instrumental cause it self, and how faith can be a Physical, I know not. 3. Nay the act is but a moral act, such as a Statute or Bond acteth, and what need Faith to be a physical Instrument?

2. My second Reason is this: It is generally concluded, that *Tota instrumenti causalitas est in usu & applicatione*; It ceaseth to be an Instrument, when it ceaseth to be used or acted by the principal cause: But faith doth most frequently cease its action, and is not used (physically) when we sleep or wholly mind other things: Therefore according to this Doctrine, faith should then cease its Instrumentality; and consequently either we should all that while be unjustified and unpardoned, or else be justified and pardoned some other way, and not by faith. All which is absurd; and easily avoided by discerning faith to be but a Condition of our Justification, or a *Causa sine qua non*.

3. If Faith be a *physical Instrument*, then it should justifie from a reason *intrinsecal*, *natural and essential* to it, and not from Gods meer ordination of it to this office by his Word of Promise: but that were at least dangerous Doctrine: and should not be entertained by them who (truly) acknowledge that it justifies not as a work; much less then as a *Physical* reception which they call its Instrumentality. The consequence of the Major is evident, in that nothing can be more intrinsecal and essential to faith (this faith) then to be what it is, *viz.* a Reception or acceptance of Christ or his Righteousness: there-

fore if it juſtifie directly as ſuch, then it juſtifieth of its own Nature.

4. It is to me a hard ſaying, that God and Faith do the ſame thing, that is, Pardon and juſtifie: and yet ſo they do if it be an Inſtrument of Juſtification: For *eadem eſt Actio Inſtrumenti & principalis cauſæ*, viz. *quoad determinationem ad hunc effectum*, *ut* Aquinas, Schibler, *&c.* I dare not ſay or think, that Faith doth ſo properly, effectively juſtifie and pardon us.

5. It ſeems to me needleſs to feign this Inſtrumentality, becauſe *fruſtra fit per plura quod fieri poteſt per pauciora.*

6. Yea it derogateth from the work; for as *Scotus* ſaith, (in 4. diſt. 45. q. 1. pag. (*mihi*) 239. D.) *Actio ſine inſtrumento eſt perfectior quàm actio cum inſtrumento.*

7. And this Doctrine makes man tobe the *cauſa proxima*, of his own Pardon and Juſtification. For it is man that believes and not God: God is the *cauſa prima*, but man the *cauſa proxima credendi*, and ſo of juſtifying, if Faith be an Inſtrument. Or at leaſt man is a *cauſe* of his own Pardon and Juſtification. Yea faith being by Divines acknowledged our own Inſtrument, it muſt needs follow that we juſtifie and forgive our ſelves. Dr. *Ameſius* ſaith, (*Bellar. Enervat. To.* 4. li 6. p. (mihi) 315.) *Plurimum refert: quia ſicut ſacramenta quamvis aliquo ſenſu poſſint dici Inſtrumenta noſtra*, &c. *proprie tamen ſunt Inſtrumenta Dei: ſic etiam fides quamvis poſſit vocari Inſtrumentum Dei, quia Deus juſtificat nos ex fide & per fidem, proprie tamen eſt Inſtrumentum noſtrum. Deus nos baptizat & paſcit, non noſmet ipſi: Nos credimus in Chriſtum, non Deus.* Whether faith may be a moral Inſtrument, I ſhall enquire, when I have anſwered the next queſtion: which is, Q. 6. *If faith were ſuch a Phyſical Paſsive (or Active) Inſtrument, whether that be the formal direct reaſon of its juſtifying? and whether (as it is) it do juſtifie directly and primarily*, quatenus eſt apprehenſio Chriſti, juſtitiæ, vel Juſtificationis. And this is it that I moſt confidently deny, and had rather you would ſtick to in debate then all the reſt: for I ground many other things on it. I affirm therefore, 1. That faith juſtifieth primarily and directly, as the condition on which the free Donor hath beſtowed Chriſt, with all his benefits in the Goſpel-conveyance. 2. And that if it

were

were a meer Physical apprehension it would not justifie; no nor do us any good. 3. And that the apprehension called the receptivity, which is truly its nature, is yet but its aptitude to its justifying office, and so a remote, & not the direct proper formal cause.

These three I will prove in order. 1. And for the first it is proved. 1. From the Tenor of the justifynig Promise, which still assureth Justification on the condition of Believing. [*He that believeth*] and [*whosoever believeth*] and [*if thou believe*] do plainly and unquestionably express such a condition, upon which we shall be justified, and without which we shall not. The *Antinomians* most unreasonably deny this. 2. And the nature of Justification makes it unquestionable: for whether you make it a Law-act, or an act of Gods own Judgement and Will determining of our state, yet nither will admit of any intervening cause, (especially any act of ours,) but only a condition. 3. Besides, Conditions depend on the will of him that bestoweth the Gift, and according to his Will they succeed: but Instruments more according to their own fitness: Now it is known well, that Justification is an act of Gods meer free Grace and Will, and therefore nothing can further conduce to Gods free act as on our part, but by way of Condition. 4. And I need not say more to this, it being acknowledged generally by all our Divines, not one that I remember excepted, besides Mr. *Walker*, that [*faith justifieth as the condition of the Covenant*] Mr. *Wotton de Reconcil. par.* 1. *l.* 2. *cap.* 18. brings you the full Testimony of the *English* Homilies, *Fox*, *Perkins*, *Paræus*, *Trelcatius*, *Dr. G. Downam*, *Scharpius*, *Th. Matthews*, *Calvin*, *Aretius*, *Sadeel*, *Olevian*, *Melancth.* *Beza*: To which I could add many more: and I never spoke with any solid Divine that denyed it.

2. Now that a physical apprehension would not justifie, as such, is evident. 1. Else *Mary* should be justified for having Christ in her womb, as I said before. 2. Else justification, as I said, should be ascribed to the nature of the act of faith it self. 3. You may see what is the primary, formal reason why faith Justifies, by its inseparablility from the effect or event; and which is the improper remote cause by its separability. Now such a physical apprehension may be (as such) separated from

from the effect, and would still be if it had not the further nature of a condition. We see it plainly in all worldly things. Every man that takes in his hand a conveyance of land, shall not possess the land. If you forcibly seize upon all a mans evidences and writings, you shall not therefore possess his estate. If a traytor snatch a pardon by violence out of anothers hand, he is not therefore pardoned. (But more of this under the next).

4. And for your passive faith, I cannot conceive how it should (as passive) have any Moral good in it (as is said,) much less justifie us. And so when God saith that without faith it is impossible to please God, we shall feign that to be justifying faith, which hath nothing in it self, that can please God: and how it can justifie that doth not please, I know not. I know *in genere entis* the Divels please God: They are his creatures; and naturally Good, as *Ens & bonum convertuntur*: but *in genere moris*, I know not yet how *pati quatenus pati* can please him. For it doth not require so much as liberty of the will: The reason of Passion is from the Agent: As *Suarez dis.* 17. §. 2. *Secundum præcisas rationes formales loquendo, Passio est ab Actione: & non è converso: Ideaque vera est & propria hæc causalis locutio, Quia agens agit, materia recipit.* Now sure all Divines as well as the free-will-men, do acknowledge, that there can be no pleasing worth or vertue, where there is not liberty. And *Suarez* saith truly in that (*T.* 1. *disp.* 19 *pag.* (*mihi*) 340.) *Addimus vero hanc facultatem quatenus libera est, non posse esse nisi Activam: seu è converso, facultatem non posse esse liberam, nisi sit activa, & quatenus activa est. Probatur sic. Nam Passio ut Passio non potest esse Libera patienti: sed solum quatenus Actio à qua talis Passio provenit, illi est libera: Ergo Libertas formaliter ac præcise non est in potentia patiente, ut sic, sed in potentia Agente.* (*Vide ultra probationem.*)

5. Yea I much fear left this Passive Doctrine do lay all the blame of all mens infidelity upon God, or most at least: For it maketh the unbeliever no otherwise faulty then a hard block for resisting the wedge, which is but by an indisposition of the matter: and so Originall indisposition is all the sin. For as *Aquinas* saith, *Malum in Patiente est vel ab imperfectione,*

vel

vel defectu agentis, vel indispositione Materiæ. 1. *q.* 4?. *a.* 1. *c.*

3. My third proposition is, that the *Receptivity or apprehension which is truly of the nature of faith, is yet but its aptitude to its Justifying office, and so a remote and not the direct proper formal reason*: And this is the main point that I insist on: And it is evident, in all that is said already: and further thus, If faith had been of that apprehending nature as it is, and yet had not been made the condition in the gift or promise of God, it would not have justified: but if it had been made the condition, though it had been no apprehending (but as any other duty,) yet it would have justified: therefore it is evident that the neareſt, proper reason of its power to justifie is Gods making it the condition of his gift, and its receptive nature is but a remote reason: 1. If faith would have justified, though it had not been a condition, then it must have justified against Gods will, which is impossible: It is God that justifieth, and therefore we cannot be a cause of his Action. 2. It is evident also from the nature of this moral reception, which being but a willingness and consent, cannot of its own nature make the thing our own, but as it is by the meer will of the donor made the condition of his offer or gift. If I am willing to be Lord of any Lands or Countreys, it will not make me so: but if the true owner say, I will give them thee if thou wilt accept them, then it will be so: therefore it is not first and directly from the nature of the reception, but first because that reception is made the condition of the gift. If a condemned man be willing to be pardoned, he shall not therefore be pardoned: but if a pardon be given on condition he be willing or accept it, then he shall have it. If a poor woman consent to have a Prince for her husband, and so to have his possessions, it shall not therefore be done, except he give himself to her on condition of her consent. If it were a meer physical reception, and we spoke of a possession *de facto* of somewhat that is so apprehensible, then it would be otherwise: as he that getteth gold or a pearl in his hand, he hath such a possession: But when it is but a moral improper reception (though *per actum physicum volendi vel consentiendi*), and when we speak of a possession

in right of Law, and of a relation and Title, then it must needs stand as aforesaid. Donation, (or imputation) being the direct cause of our first constitutive justification, therefore conditionality and not the naturalreceptivity of faith, must needs be the proper reason of its justifying. This is acknowledged by Divines: *Amesius* saith, (*Bellarm. Enervat. T.* 4. *p.* (*m hi*) 314. *Apprehensio justificationis per veram fiduciam, non est simpliciter per modum objecti, sed per modum objecti nobis donati: Quod enim Deus donaverit fidelibus Christum & omnia cum eo, Scriptura disertis verbis testatur, Rom.* 8. 32. 2. And that if any other sort or act of faith, as well as this, or any other grace would have justified, if God had made it equally the condition of his gift, is also past all doubt. 1. Because the whole work of Justifying dependeth meerly on Gods free Grace and will, and thence it is that faith is deputed to its office. 2. Who doubteth but God could have bestowed pardon and justification on other terms or conditions, if he would? 3. Yea who doubteth but he might have given them without any condition, even that of acceptance? Yea though we had never known that there had been a Redeemer, yet God might have justified us for his sake. I speak not what he may now do after he resolved of a course in his Covenant: But doubtless he might have made the Covenant to be an absolute promise without any condition on our part if he would, even such as the *Antinomians* dream it to be. And me thinks those great Divines, that say with *Twisse*, *Chamier*, *Walæus*, *&c.* that God might have pardoned us without a Redeemer, should not deny this especially. 4. And doubtless that faith which the Israelites in the first ages were justified by, did much differ from ours now. whatever that doth which is required of poor Indians now; that never heard of Christ. 5. And God pardoneth and justifieth Infants, without any actual reception of pardon by their faith.

2. And me thinks they that stand for the instrumentality of faith above all should not deny this; for (according to my Logick) the formality of an Instrument is in its actual subserviency to the principal cause: and therefore it is no longer *causa instrumentalis* then it is used: and therefore whatsoever

ver is the *materia* of the instrument, or whatsoever is natural to it, cannot be its form: Now to be a reception or apprehension of Christ, is most essentially natural to this act of faith, and therefore cannot be the form of its instrumentality. For as *Scotus* saith (*in 4. sent. dist. 1 q. 5. Fol. (miki) 13. H.*) *instrumenti idoneitas præcedit naturaliter usum ejus ut instrumentum.* And what is the *Idoneitas* or *Aptitude* of faith but this? And as *Scotus ibid.* saith, *Nullum instrumentum formaliter est ideo aptum ad usum, quia aliquis utitur eo ut instrumento*: but it is an Instrument *quia aliquis utitur, &c.*

3. And if the reception were the most direct, proper cause, (especially if the physical reception) then it would follow, that justifying faith (as such) is the receiving of justification, or of Christs righteousness, but not the receiving of Christ himself, or that the receiving of Christ would be but a preparatory act, which is I dare say foul and false Doctrine, and contrary to the scope of Scripture which makes Christ himself the object of this faith; and the receiving of *him* (*John* 1. 11, 12.) and believing in *him* to be the *condition* of justification; and the receiving of *righteousness*, but secondarily or remotely. *Amesius* saith (*ubi supra*) *hic tamen observandum est accurate loquendo, apprehensionem Christi & justitiæ ejus esse fidem justificantem, quia justificatio nostra exurgit ex apprehensione Christi, & apprehensio justificationis ut possessionis nostræ præsentis, fructus est & effectum apprehensionis prioris.* So in his *Medulla* he makes Christ himself the object of justifying faith.

4. Also if the said reception were the immediate proper reason why faith justifyeth; then it would follow that it is one act of faith whereby we are pardoned (*viz.* the reception of pardon) and another whereby we are justified (*viz.* the Reception either of righteousness or justification:) and there must be another act of faith for Adoption, and another for every other use according to the variety of the Objects. But this is a vain fiction, it being the same believing in Christ, to which the Promise of Remission, Justification, Adoption, Glorification, and all is made.

Also it would contradict the Doctrine of our best Divines, who say, as *Alstedius*, *Distinct. Theol. C.* 17 *p.* 73. that Christ is

our Righteousnes *in sensu causali, sed non in sensu formali.* I conclude this with the plain Testimony of our best Writers. *Perkins* vol. 1. pag. 662. *In the true Gain, saith: And lest any should imagine that the very Act of faith inapprehending Christ justifieth: we are to understand that faith doth not apprehend by Power from it self, but by vertue of the Covenant. If a man believe the Kingdom of* France *to be his, it is not therefore his: yet if he belive Christ and the Kingdom of Heaven by Christ to be his, it is his indeed: not simply because he believes, but because he believes upon Commandment and Promise.* (that is not properly as an Instrument, but as a condition) *For in the tenor of the Covenant God promiseth to impute the Obedience of Christ to us for our Righteousnes if we believe.* Is not this as plain as may be? So *Bullinger Decad.* 1. *Serm.* 6. *p.* (*mihi*) 44. *We say faith justifieth for it self, not as it is a quality in our mind, or our own work: but as faith is a gift of Gods grace, having the promise of righteousnes and life.* &c. *Therefore faith justifieth for Christ, and from the grace and Covenant of God.*

This being therefore fully proved, that faith justifieth properly and directly as the *condition* on which God hath made over Christ and all his benefits in the Gospel, the two great points opposed in my Doctrine do hence arise unavoidably. 1. That this faith justifieth as truly and directly as it is the receiving of Christ for Lord, and King, and Head, and Husband, as for a justifier, for both are equally the conditions in the Gospel. But if the physical Instrumental way were found, then it would justifie only as it is a receiving of Justification or Justice. This is the main conclusion I contest for. Yield me this, and I will not so much stick at any of the rest. 2. And hence it follows, that Repentance, forgiving others, love to Christ, Obedience Evangelical, do so far justifie as the Gospel-promise makes them conditions; and no further do I plead for them.

7. My last Question was, *Whether now your Doctrine or mine be the more obscure, doubtfull and dangerous? And which is the more clear, certain and safe?*

And here I shall first shew you yet more what my Judgement is, and therein whether Faith be a moral Instrument.

I think that *conditio sine quâ non, non potest esse efficiens, quia*

hujus

cujus nulla est actio; nec id ad cujus præstationem aliquid contigit circa illius actionem: nec materialis dispositio est Instrumentum, &c. ut *Scheibler, Top. c. 3. pag.* 102. Even the Gospel Promise which is far more properly called Gods moral Instrument of justifying or pardoning, is yet but somewhat to the making up that *fundamentum*, from whence the relation of *justitia* doth result. And the *Fundamentum* is called a cause of the relation which ariseth from it without any act, but what went to cause the foundation, even by a meer resultancy, as *D'Oriolis* fully in 1. *sent. dist.* 17. *q.* 1. But to call a condition in Law an *Instrument*, is yet far more improper. The Law or Promise therefore I will call a moral Instrument: the condition which we must perform, I will not call a moral Instrument either of the Act which God performeth, or yet of the effect which floweth from that act immediately. Yet if any will say that it is properly and principally a condition, and that it so justifieth; and yet that it may be called an Instrument moral in an improper sence, as it is a condition first, or else in regard of its receiving use, will stretch the word *Instrument* so wide, as to apply it to it; I will not contend for a word, when we agree in sence. And thus Mr. *Weston* yieldeth as with an ill will to call it an Instrument, proving it first to justifie as a condition. But I am loth to give it any proper causality in justifying.

And now let us see whose sence is 1. More obscure. I avoid and abhor all vain niceties in so fundamental a point as Justification is; therefore I say plainly but [*That faith is the condition on which God hath bestowed* (here) *and will bestow all the benefits in the Gospel*] What woman cannot understand this at a word? But your Doctrine, what *Oedipus* is able to unfold? for my part, it is quite past my reach; and most that I converse with, are as silly as my self. Can every poor man or woman reach to know what a *passive Action*, or a *passive Passion*, or a *Passive Instrument* is? and how we receive Christ, as a man takes a gift in his hand? or to see through all the difficulties that I have discovered here in your Doctrine? Even they that raise questions, *what one act of faith doth justifie, whether of the Understanding or Will? Whether Assent or Affiance*, &c. Do seem vainly and

hurtfully curious to me: much more those that reduce all to an unconceivable *pati*: I plainly therefore affirm, that faith is not any physical receiving, (as the hand doth receive money, as you would afterward make me believe the Assembly means) but a Metaphorical moral receiving: and that it is not by any one act of the soul (much less a Passion) but by the whole soul, Understanding and Will: the former beginning, the later consummating it, (as *Davenant* soundly.) And let us trye by common speech, which of these is the more plain and probable sence. Suppose a Prince will redeem a *Turkish* condemed slave, and send him word [*I have bought thee, and if thou wilt receive (or take) me for thy Redeemer, Deliverer and Lord, and for the future wilt serve me and be thankfull, I will actually set thee free.* Here it would sure be a silly thing to fall a questioning, what the Prince means by the word [*Receive or take*] Whether it be an act of this faculty, or that? Whether this or that act? Or whether it is meerly *Pati*? Though we are too wise to understand this now; I warrant you the foolishest slave would soon understand it: and know that to receive or take the Prince for his Redeemer, is to believe him, and consent, and thankfully accept of him as he requires, and of deliverance by him: And he that should ask him, Whether it were the bare act of affiance, or whether gratitude or love were included in the term? would seem but simple to him. If a Prince will deliver a condemned woman from death, and offer with all to marry her, and give her himself, and all he hath, on condition she will receive or take him for her husband, (and accordingly be a faithfull wife to him till death) He that should here step in, and raise profound Scruples, and enter difficult disputes, whether this receiving were an act of the Understanding or Will? Whether Affiance, Recombency, Assurance, *&c.* or whether a Passion? would be well judged ridiculous; when every man knows at the first word what it is for the woman to receive or take a man for her Husband, even gladly and lovingly to consent and accept the offer, and with all her heart deliver up her self to him accordingly. So if a King of another Nation, that hath right also to *this*, but not possession, should send to us, to charge us to receive him for our King; what a hard word is this to understand?

ſtand? or doth it ſignifie any one act? or the act of any one ſingle faculty that the people of the land muſt perform? Oh how too learned Divines (or too unlearned) have puzzled and amazed poor ſouls, and muddyed the clear ſtreams of the Doctrine of Chriſt, in this ſo weighty and plain a point of juſtification? In a word, Sir, I know there is never a one of my Hearers can underſtand your Doctrine of inſtrumentality Active or Paſſive, nor have they the Logick neceſſary thereto, and therefore I will not ſpeak to them in ſuch a language. Even while I untye your knots, I am thought a *Barbarian*, and not underſtood; how much more if I ſpoke what I underſtand not my ſelf nor am able, though I ſet my wits on the tenter?

2. And then let us ſee which is the *truer and certainer*, your Doctrine or mine. And 1. I have ſaid ſomewhat already to weaken the credit of yours. 2. And more from what is laſt ſaid. it is unlikely to me to be true becauſe of the obſcurity; for I believe God hath ſpoke plainer in fundamentals, and not laid ſoles ſalvation upon that which none but Scholars of a better or worſe judgement then I can underſtand. I know there is that kind of difficulty in Divine things which requireth the ſpiritual illumination of the underſtanding: but not ſuch in foundation points that neceſſarily requireth ſo much humane learning. 3. Your way hath not one word of Scripture for it: Where doth Scripture ſay (in phraſe or ſenſe) that *faith ſ juſtifieth as an inſtrument*; *or that it is ſuch ? Active or Paſſive ?* Or that it is *this or that only Act ?*

But now for the Doctrine I teach. 1. Neither your ſelf nor any ſolid man denyeth it (that faith is *a condition and ſo juſtifieth*:) and that it is a *Moral receiving*, and by the *whole ſoul*, eſepcially the *hearty conſent, and acceptance of the will*, moſt Divines teach, as I could ſhew but for waſting time. 2. I prove it further, that it is but this plain Moral reception, thus. As Chriſt is offered, ſo he is received (therefore the Aſſembly ſay [*as he is offered in the Goſpel*]: But Chriſt is offered *Morally* in the Goſpel, and not *Phyſically*; therefore he muſt be ſo received. 3. *Rejicere eſt nolle*; *Ergo, recipere eſt velle.* To reject Chriſt is the condemning ſin of infidelity: but that lies in an unwillingneſs to have him to be their Redeemer, Saviour, and

and especially Lord: therefore receiving Christ is a willingness, consent or acceptance of him for Redeemer and Lord, *Joh.*1.10. *His own received him not*; What is that but they refused him? and not that they wree not *Passive physical receivers of Justice*, Luke 19.27. *These mine enemies that would not I should reign over them, bring hither and destroy, &c.* Then willingness of his reign is part of that faith which justifies: Even willingness of his Reign, as well as to be pardoned, justified and saved from Hell by him; (or else few among us would perish; For I never met with the man that was unwilling of these.)

3. And then it will easily appear, *Whether your Doctrine or mine be the more safe.* 1. Yours hath the many inconveniences already mentioned. It maketh man his own justifier, or the *causa proxima* of his own Justification, and by his own Act *to help* God to justifie us: for so all instruments do help the principal cause. And yet by a self-contradiction it maketh faith to be of no Moral worth, and so no vertue or grace. Yea, (I think) it layeth the blame of mans infidelity on God; Many such wayes it seemeth to wrong the Father and the Mediator. 2. And it seemeth also to wrong mens souls in point of safety, both by drawing them so to wrong God, and also by laying grounds to encourage them in presumption; For when they are taught that the receiving of Christs righteousness, or of Christ for justification, or the confident expectation of pardon, or resting on Christ for it, or a particular perswasion of it, *&c.* Is justifying faith, and when they find these in themselves (as undoubtedly they may will this much, or else they cannot presume), Is it not easie then to think they are safe when they are not? As I said, I never yet met with the man that was not willing to be *justified and saved from Hell by Christ*: and I dare say, *Really* willing: and but with few that did not *expect* it from Christ, and trust him for it. Now to place Justifying faith only in that which is so common, and to tell the men that yet they believe not truly when they have all that is made essential to faith, as Justifying, is strange. For knowing that the godly themselves have fowly sinned, and that no man can perish that hath Justifying faith, how can they choose but presume when they find that which is called Justifying faith

un-

undoubtedly in themselves? And to tell them it is not sincere or true, because they receive not Christ also as King and Prophet, and yet that such receiving is no part of justifying faith. This is to tell them that the truth of their faith lyeth without it self (a strange Truth) in a signal concomitant: and who will doubt of his faith for want of a concomitant sign, when he certainly feeleth the thing it self? Will not such think they may sin *salva fide*? When as if they were rightly taught, that justifying saving faith (as such) is the receiving of Christ for Saviour, and Lord, and so a giving up themselves both to be saved and guided by him, then they would find that faith in Christ and sincere obedience to Christ have a little neerer relation; and then a man might say to such a presumer, as I remember *Tertullian* excellently doth, *De pœnitent. Operum pag.* (*mihi*) 119. *Cæterum non leviter in Domino peccat qui quum æmulo ejus Diabolo pœnitentiâ renunciasset, & hoc nomine illum Domino subjecisset, rursus eundem regressu suo erigit, & exultatione ejus seipsum facit, ut denuo malus recuperata præda sua, adversus Dominum gaudeat. Nonne quod dicere quoque periculosum est, sed ad ædificationem proferendum est, diabolum Domino præponit? Comparationem enim videtur egisse qui utrumq; cognoverit, & judicato pronunciasse eum meliorem cujus se rursus esse maluerit, &c. Sed aiunt quidam, satis Deum habere, si corde & animo suspiciatur, licet actu minus fiat: itaque se salvo metu & Fide peccare: Hoc est salva castitate Matrimonia violare: salva pietate parenti venenum temperare; sic ergo & ipsi salva venia in Gehennam detrudentur, dum salvo metu peccant.*

Again, your Doctrine seemeth to me to overthrow the comfort of Believers exceedingly. For how can they have any comfort that know not whether they are justified and shall be saved? and how can they know that, who know not whether they have faith? and how can they know that, when they know not what justifying faith is? and how can they know what it is, when it is by Divines involved in such a cloud and maze of difficulties? some placing it in this, act and some in that, and some in a Passive instrumentality, which few understand, (If any man in the world do.) For the Habit of faith, that cannot be felt or known of it self immediately, but by

its acts (for so it is concluded of all Habits, *Suarez, Metap. T. 2. disp. 44. §. 1. pag. 332.*) and instead of the act we are now set to enquire after the passion? and so in the work of examination the business is to enquire, *how and when we did passively receive righteousness, or justification, or Christ for these?* which let him answer for himself that can; for I cannot.

But now, on the other side, what inconvenience is there in the Doctrine of faith and justification as I deliver it? As it is plain, and certain (saying no more then is generally granted) so I think it is safe. Do I ascribe any of Christs honour in the work to man? No man yet hath dared to charge me with that, to my knowledge: and no considerate man I believe will do it. I conclude that neither faith nor works is the least part of our legal righteousness: or of that righteousness which we must plead against the accuser for our justification: which is commonly called by Divines, the matter of our justification. The Law which we have broken cannot be satisfied (nor God for the breach of it) in the least measure by our faith or obedience, nor do they concur as the least degree of that satisfaction: But we must turn the Law over wholly to our Surety. Only whereas he hath made a new Law or Covenant containing the conditions on our part of the said justification and salvation, I say, these conditions must needs be performed, and that by our selves: and who dare deny this? and I say that the performance of these conditions is our *Evangelical righteousness* (in reference to that Covenant,) as Christs satisfaction is our legal Righteousness (in reference to that first Covenant), or as perfect obedience would have been our legal righteousness, if we had so obeyed. And for them that speak of inherent Righteousness in any other sense, *viz.* as it is an imperfect conformity to the Law of works, rather then as a true conformity to the Law or Covenant of grace, I renounce their Doctrine, both as contradictory to it self, and to the truth, and as that which would make the same Law to curse and bless the same man, and which would set up the desperate Doctrine of Justification by the works of the Law: For if men are righteous in reference to that Law, then they may be so far justified by it.

Nor do I ascribe to works any part of the office or honour of faith

faith (Though that were not so dangerous as to derogate from Christ.) For I acknowledge faith the only condition of our first Remission and justification: and the principal part of the condition of our justification as continued and consummate. And if faith be an instrumental cause, I do not give that honor from it to works, for they are not so: Nay, I boldly again aver, that I give no more to *obedience to Christ*, then Divines ordinarily do, that is, to be the secondary part of the condition of continued and consummate justification. Only I give not so much as others to faith, because I dare not ascribe so much to man. And yet men make such a noise with the terrible name of *Justification by Works* (the Lords own phrase), as if I gave more then themselves to man, when I give so much less.

And thus Sir, I have according to your advice, spent my self (as you speak) in aiming at that mark which you were pleased to set me. And now I shall proceed to the rest of your exceptions.

My next answer to you was, that [*If works under every notion are excluded (as you say they are) then repentance is excluded under the notion of a condition or preparative: But repentance under that notion is not excluded: Therefore not Works under every notion.* To this you reply, that [*Repentance is not excluded as qualifying, but as recipient,*] which what is it but a plain yielding my Minor, and so the cause: For this is as much as I say. If repentance be a work or act of ours, and not excluded under the notion of a qualification, (or as you elsewhere yield) a *Medium ordinatum*, and a condition, then works are not under every notion excluded. And that repentance is not recipient, how easily do I yeild to you? But do you indeed think that when *Paul* excludeth the works of the Law, that he excludeth them only as Recipient? and not as qualifying? If so, (as this answer seems to import, seeing you will not have me here distinguish between works of Law, and of Gospel, or New Covenant) then you give abundance more to works of the Law then I do or dare: For I aver that *Paul* excludeth them even as qualifications, yea and the very presence of them: and that the Jews never dreamt of their works being Recipient.

To my next you say, [*Whether Paul dispute what is our righteousness, or upon what terms it is made ours it doth not much matter*] But I think it of very great moment; they being Questions so very much different, both in their sense, and importance. And whereas you think *Paul* speaks chiefly of the manner, I think he speaks of both, but primarily of the (*quasi*) *materia*; and of the manner or means thereto, but secondarily in reference to that. So that I think the chief Question which *Paul* doth debate, was, *Whether We are Justified by our own works or merits, or by Anothers, viz.* the satisfaction of a surety? which yet because it is no way made ours but by believing, therefore he so puts the Question, whether by works of the Law, or by faith? and so that he makes them two immediate opposites, not granting any *tertium*, I easily yield. (*But of that before.*)

To the next you say, that [*I cannot find such a figure for faith Relatively in my sense.*] *Answ.* And I conceive that faith in my sense may be taken Relatively full as well as in yours. Doubtless acceptance of an offered Redeemer and all his benefits doth relate as properly to what is accepted (*viz.* by the assent of the understanding initially, and by the election and consent of the will consummately) as a *Physical Passive reception or instrumentality* can do. And also as it is a condition I make little doubt, but it relateth to the thing given on that condition: and that the very name of a condition is relative. So that in my sense faith relateth to Christ two ways: Whereof the former is but its very nature, and so its aptitude to its office: The later is that proper respect in which it immediately or directly justifieth. Yet do I not mean as you seem to do, as I gather by your phrase of [*putting Love and Obedience for Christs Righteousness*]: For I conceive it may be put relatively, and yet not strictly (*loco correlati*) for the thing related to: when I say my hands or teeth feed me, I do not put them instead of my Meat; and yet I use the words relatively, meaning my Meat principally, and my teeth secondarily: Neither do I mean that it relateth to Christs *righteousness* only or principally; but first to *himself*. And I doubt not but *Love* to Christ and Obedience to him as Redeemer, do relate to him: but not so fully, clearly and directly express him as related to, as *Faith*: Faith being also so comprehensive a grace as to include

clude some others. It is a true saying, that a poor woman that is marryrd to a Prince is *made honourable by love*, and *continued so by duty to her husband*: But it is more obscure and improper then to say, she is made *honourable by Marriage*, or taking such a man to her husband, which includes love, and implyeth duty and faithfulness, as necessarily subsequent. I conceive with Judicious *Doctor Preston*, that faith is truly and properly such a consent, contract, or marriage with Christ.

Next to your similitude: you say [*that I hold that not only seeing this brazen Serpent, but any other Actions of sense, will as well heal the Wounded Christian.*] To which I answer. Similitudes run not on all four. Thus far I believe that this holds. 1. Christ was lift up on the Cross as the brazen Serpent was lift up. 2. He was lift up for a cure to sin-stung souls, as the brazen Serpent for the stung bodies. 3. That as every one that looked on the Serpent was cured (an easie condition,) so every one that believeth Christ to be the appointed Redeemer, and heartily Accepteth him on the terms he is offered, and so trusteth in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life. 4. That as the cure of their bodies came not from any natural reason drawn from the eye, or from any natural excellency or efficacy of seeing, above hearing or feeling, but meerly from the free will and pleasure of God, who ordained that looking should be the condition of their cure: So all those Acts (usually comprized or implyed in the word believing) which justifie, do it not from any natural excellency, efficacy or instrumentality, but meerly from the good pleasure of the Lawgiver: And therefore the natural Receptivity of Faith (that is its very formal essence) must not be given as the proper direct cause of its Justifying: But that is, its conditionality from the free appointment of God.

But on the other side, 1. It was only one Act of one sense which was the condition of their cure: but you will not say I believe that it is only one act of one faculty which justifieth: however I will not. 2. It was the Act of seeing which cured them, without touching, laying hold on, apprehending, relling on, *&c.* But you will not say so of justifying faith. 3. The sight, which was the condition of their cure, was no actuall reception of the bra-

zen Serpent, but the *species* of that Serpent by the eye; and so the eye did no otherwise receive the Serpent, then it received every Object it beheld, even the Serpent that stung them. But if you say, that our receiving Christ is but *per simplicem apprehensionem objecti*, and that it is a receiving of his *species*, and so that we receive Christ no otherwise then we receive Satan, or any Object of Knowledge, I will not be of that opinion. 4. Their cure was *simul & semel*: but our Justification is a continued Act; as really in doing all our lives, as at first. 5 Therefore though one act finished their cure, and there was no condition perscribed as requisite for the consummation or continuance: yet when our Justification is begun, and we truly justified, there is further conditions prescribed for its continuance and consummation. To conclude, I am so far from saying, that any other Act will as well heal the wounded Christian, besides what God hath made the expres condition of his cure, that I flatly aver no other will do it. But whether he hath made any one single act (or Pasion) to be the whole of that condition, I have elsewhere out of Scripture shewed you, and you do not deny what I say.

My two last Answers to your exposition of *Pauls* words, you are pleased to overpass; the last of which (the ninth) being the main that I made use of: *viz.* that *Paul* taketh the word *Works* more strictly, for such working as maketh the Reward to be not of Grace but of debt: and in this sence I disclaim all works, not only (as you do) from being receptive, or instrumental, or effective, but from being concomitant: why you said nothing to this my chief Answer, I do not know.

You next tell me that [*I cannot take the Assemblies definition in that sence as they declare it, or the Scripture words, which are Metaphorical, imply: for its the resting of a burdened soul upon Christ only for Righteousness; and by this Christs Righteousness is made over to us; and its a receiving of Christ as the hand embraceth any Object, &c.* Answer. That the word *Receiving* and *Resting* are Metaphorical, I easily grant you; and wonder the more that you still insist on them, and instead of reducing them to more proper expresions, do here add Metaphor to Metaphor, till all your definition be a meer Allegory, when you know

know how much Metaphors do seduce. But for the Assemblies Definition, I embrace it unfeignedly in that sence as the words seem to me most evidently to import, without using violence with them. But I perceive by this, that you will not think it enough in a man to subscribe to national Confessions and Catechisms in the obvious sence, or that which he judgeth the plain proper sence, except he also agree with you in the explication. Some think it not enough that we subscribe to the Scripture, because we may misunderstand it, and therefore we must subscribe to national Confessions, as more explicate: (which I like well, so we add nothing to Gods word, nor thrust our own Commentaries into the Text, or obtrude our own Doctrines upon men as Articles of their faith, or at least, as the Bishops did the Ceremonies, which they made indifferent in word, but necessary indeed:) But now I perceive the matter come all to one in the Issue; when you cannot make a definition of Faith in such Language as is any easier to be understood then the Scripture: when you and I cannot both understand it: and I find that many are of *Bellarmines* judgement (*Apol. c.* 7. cited by Mr. *Vines* in his Sermon against *Heref. pag.* 50.) That a man may be an *Heretick*, though he believe the Scriptures, the three Creeds, and the four great general Councils. But for the sence of the Assemblies definition, I I know not what you mean by the words [*as they declare it*:] If any private declaration, I am not to take notice of it, nor do I know what it meaneth, and could wish they would do, or might have done as Mr. *Vines* desired in his Sermon, *Jan.* 28. 1645. that is, [*To second their conclusions with the Reasons and Grounds of them; which will do much to make them pass for currant: seeing* (*faith he*) *the* Gorgons *head which struck all dumb in former times*, The Church, The Church, *is not likely to have the same operation now in this seeing and searching age; for though men be willing to be subject to Authority, yet as they are men they will be slaves to Reason.*] So that if there were any private exposition, I would we had it. But if you mean only what is declared in the words of the Definition, I am most confident, though I never was in the Assembly, that I have hit on their sence far neerer then you seem to have done: and I dare not think otherwise, lest I be hainously

censorious

cenſorious of ſo reverend an Aſſembly, which I am reſolved not to be. 1. Their very words are a *receiving of Chriſt*, and not immediately and primarily his *Righteouſneſs*, but himſelf; and in the confeſſion they ſay as I do, that it is an accepting, receiving and reſting on Chriſt. 2. And as *Chriſt* the anointed, which Name ſignifieth the Offices which he is anointed to, *viz.* King, Prieſt, *&c.* 3. It maketh it to conſiſt in no one act, but ſeveral, expreſſed in two phraſes: 1. Receiving Chriſt. 2. Reſting on him alone for ſalvation. 4. It expreſly ſaith, that it is *a receiving of him, as he is offered in the Goſpel*, and that is, not as a juſtifier only, but as a Lord and Prophet, and that as immediately as the other, and conjunct with it: for he is no where offered as a juſtifier alone; if he be, ſhew where it is. 5. And hence it is plain that they mean no Reception but moral, by Willing, Conſenting, Accepting (as they expreſly ſay in the confeſſion of Faith) For he is no otherwiſe offered to us in the Goſpel: He is not offered to our Phyſical Reception. It is not his perſon in ſubſtance that is offered to the Contact of our Spirits, much leſs of our fleſh; but his perſon as cloathed with his Relations, of Mediator, Redeemer, Lord, Saviour, *&c.* And can you receive a King, as King, (who is perſonally diſtant or inviſible) by any other Reception then I have ſaid? If we do receive a King into *England*, the only Acts of the ſoul are *hearty conſenting*, and what is therein and thereto impl, ed: though bodily Actions may follow: (which as to Chriſt we cannot perform.) I think verily this is the plain ſound ſence of the Aſſembly, and ſhall believe ſo, till the ſame Authority, that thus defined, do otherwiſe interpret their own definition.

And for your phraſe of [*Reſting a burdened ſoul on Chriſt for Righteouſneſs*] I doubt not as it intendeth Affiance, but it is as *Perkins*, Dr. *Downam*, *Rob. Baronius*, *&c.* ſay, a fruit of faith ſtrictly taken, rather then faith it ſelf: but if you take faith in a larger ſence (as the Goſpel not ſeldom doth, and againſt which I am no adverſary) ſo Affiance is part of faith it ſelf. But that it is the whole of that faith, I ſhall never believe without ſtronger Arguments; where you ſay, [*Its the receiving Chriſt as the hand embraceth any Object.*] I anſwer.

1. I

1. I am glad you here grant Christ himself to be the Object. 2. If you mean, [*as verily as the hand, &c.*] So I grant it, if a moral receiving may be properly said to be as true as a physical. But if you mean *By a Physical Contact and Reception as the hand doth, &c.* then I am far from believing that ever Christ or our Assembly so meant, or ever had so gross a thought. Where you say, *I take it not the instance as the Scripture Words imply*; I answer. When I see that manifested I shall believe it. When it is said *John* 1. *He came to his own, and his own received him not*: 1. Is it meant they took him not in their hands, or received not his Person into their houses? the later is true: But 1. Only in a second place; but their hearts were the first Receptacle 2. Else those were no Unbelievers where Christ never came in person; And that had no houses; 3. And that receiving cannot belong to us that never saw him, nor to any since his Ascension. 2. Or is it the Intellective Reception of his *species*? I trow not: I have said enough of that before. 3. Or is it a moral Reception of him as thus and thus related, *volendo, eligendo, consentiendo, diligendo* (pardon this last, it is but the qualification of the rest) *& consequenter fidendo*? I think this is it. If you can find a fourth way, you will do that which was never done (to my knowledge) and then you will be a Novellist as well as I.

For your next expressions, I answer to them, that you do truly apprehend that I am loth to seem to recede from others, (and as loth to do it, but *magis amica veritas*: And I cannot believe what my list, nor like those that can.) By which you may truly know, that I do it not out of affectation of singularity (as he knoweth that knoweth my heart), nor intend to be any instrument of division in the Church. And if my assertions are destructive of what others deliver, it is but what some men, and not what all deliver; Not against the Assembly, nor many learned Divines who from several parts of the Land have signified to me their Assent: besides all those great names that appear for me in print.

But you tell me that [*I may not build on some Homiletical popular expressions in any mans books.*] *Answer*, Let me again name to you but the men I last named, and try whether you

will again so entitle their writings. The first and chief is Dr. *Preston*, who was known to be a man of most choice notions, and so Judged by those that put out his books, and his credit so great in *England*, that he cracks his own that seeks to crack it. And his Sermons were preached before as judicious an Auditory (at least) as your Lectures, and yet you defend your own expressions. Yea it is not once nor twice, nor five times only, but almost through all his Books, that Dr. *Preston* harpeth upon this string, as if it were the choisest notion that he intended to disclose. Yea it is in his very Definition of faith as justifying; and Dr. *Preston* was no homiletical Definer. I can produce the like Testimony of Dr. *Stoughton*: (two as great Divines in my esteem as most ever *England* or the world bred.) Another is Mr. *Wallis*: Doubtless, Sir, no homiletical popular man in Writing: nor could you have quickly bethought you of an *English* Book that less deserves those attributes: His words are these. *I assent not to place the saving Act of faith, either with Mr.* Cotton (*as his Lordship cites him*) *in the laying hold of, or assenting to that Promise*, &c. *nor yet in a particular application of Christ to my self in assurance, or a believing that Christ is mine*, &c. *But I choose rather to place it in an act of the Will, then in either of these forenamed acts of the Understanding. It is an Accepting of Christ offered, rather then an Assenting to a proposition affirmed. To as many as received him*, &c. *that is, to them that believe in his name.* John 1. *God makes an Offer of Christ to all (else should not Reprobates be condemned for not accepting of him, as neither the Devils are, because he was not offered to them.) Whosoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely*, Rev. 22. 17. *Whereupon the believing soul replies, I will: and so takes him. When a Gift is offered to me, that which maketh it to be mine is my Acceptation*, &c. *If you call this taking of Christ (or consenting that Christ shall be my Saviour) a Depending, a Resting or relying on Christ for salvation (if you speak of an act of the Will) it is all one; for Taking of Christ to be my Saviour, and committing my self to Christ to be saved, is the same: Both of them being but a consenting to this Covenant, I will be your God, and you shall be my People*, &c. *And if you make this the saving Act of faith, then will Repentance (so far as it is distinct from Faith) be a consequent*

sequent of it: *Confidence also, &c.* Thus Mr. *Wallis* is clear, that the Nature of Faith is the same that I have affirmed, and in no popular Sermon, but in his *Truth tryed. pag* 94,95. And on these grounds he well answers *Bellarmines Dilemma*, which else will be but shiftingly answered. The next is Mr. *Norton* of New *England*, a man judged one of their best Disputants, or else they would not have chose him to encounter *Apollonius*: And will you call his very Definition of Faith in an accurate Catechism, an homiletical popular expression? What then in the whole world shall escape that censure? His Words are: [Quest. *What is justifying Faith?* Answ. *It is a saving grace of the Spirit, flowing from Election, whereby the soul receiveth Jesus Christ, as its Head and Saviour, according as he is revealed in the Gospel.*] I subscribe to this Definition from my heart. The next cited was Mr. *Culverwell*, not in any popular Sermon, but in a solid well approved Treatise of Faith, and not in common passages, but his very definition of faith. *pag.* 13.17. and after all concludes. *pag.* 19. [*Thus we see that the very nature of faith consisteth in the true Acceptation of Christ proclaimed in the Gospel*] The next I cited (about the Definition of faith) was Mr. *Throgmorton*, who in his accurate Treatise of Faith (and not in any popular Sermons) and that many times over, doth make Faith to be the *receiving Christ for Prophet, and only* Rabbi, *to be his Disciples, and as the only Way and Truth, and also as King, Head, Husband, Priest, &c. and by this we are made Partakers of him and all his benefits. pag.* 6.29.31. 82. *&c.* And for the great point that you stick at of Justification, I will repeat the words of two of those Authors which I have named: And 1. Of learned *Conr. Bergius*, in whom you shall have the Testimony of the *Augustane* Confession, *Luther, Meutzer, &c.* included, both about the nature and extent of Faith; about works Legal and Evangelical; about Justification as begun, and as continued, and the distinct conditions, and about the concurrence of Obedience, *&c. Praxis Cathol. dissert.* 7. pag. 973. &c. §. 41. *Nec tamen negat quisquam fidem esse Obedientiam in sano sensu, ex* Rom. 1.5. & 6.17. & 10. 16, & 16 26. 2 Thess. 1 8. Act. 5.32. Heb. 5.9. 1 Pet. 1.2, 14, 2. 1. *Fides est obedientia quatenus ejus actus proprius respondet præ-*

cepto Evangelii, Crede in dominum Jesum, &c. *Ideo enim, ut* Calvinus *ait ad* Rom. 1.5. *nomine obedientiæ insignitur, quod Dominus per Evangelium nos vocat, nos vocanti per fidem respondemus. Et sic fides, (ut loquitur* Apol. Augusf. Conf. *in resp. ad Arg.* pag. 125.) *est Obedientia erga Evangelium : quæ cum Obedientia mandatorum legis minime confundi debet.* Nam ut recte Mutzerus (*in exeg* Augusf Conf. & 4 cont. Phot. in. 15.) *Quantum ab Evangelii Lex distat, tantum hæc obedientia ab illa disterminatur.* 42. *Est etiam fides obedientia, quatenus per Synecdochen Metonymicam significat totum cultum à fidelibus præstitum; radicem una cum fructibus*, &c. *Nota enim est consuetudo sermonis (ut inquit* Apol. Conf. Augusf. *de impl. leg.* pag. 87.) *quod interdum eodem verbo causam & effectus complectimur κατὰ συνεκδοχήν. Ita accipi potest fides,* Heb. 13.7. and 12.1,2. Rom. 1.8. 1 Thess. 1.8. Ier. 7.28. 43. *Nec dubium est cum dicitur, hoc est mandatum ut credamus & Diligamus;* 1 John 3.23. *sicut in præcepto Diligendi & habitus charitatis & fructus atque Opera, ad quæ habitus ordinatur, mandata sunt : ita etiam in præcepto credendi & habitum fidei & fructus ejus nobis mandatos esse. Unde cum ipsa etiam charitas inter fructus sit fidei, fit ut tota doctrina Christiana aliquando verbum vel prædicatio fidei, tota Religio Christiana, tota œconomia novi Testamenti fides præcipue appelletur,* Gal. 1. 23. 1 Tim. 4.6. Gal. 5..6. and 3.23. So he proceeds and alledges *Luther* taking faith in that large sense, including charity and obedience; and by Works, meaning *actiones factas cum opinione meriti, & cum expectatione justificationis & vitæ æternæ tanquam mercedis debitæ Serm. de mis. & li. de libert. Christiana. Tom.* 2. *Wit. f.* 4. 5. *& Tom.* 5. *com. in* Zach. 2.8. *& ad* Gal. c. 2. f. 300. *Et ultra p.* 977. *Cum dicitur [sine operibus legis] excluduntur,* 1. *Opera facta in veritate obedientiæ legalis, ac meriti proinde per innocentiam, cui detur Merces citra remissionem peccati & imputationem secundum gratiam.* Rom. 4.3. *& s. Quia causatus est Apostolus toto capite* 1 & 2. & s. *Talem Obedientiam à nemine haberi, sed omnes sub peccato esse*, &c. 2. *Excluduntur etiam opera facta cum opinione veræ obedientiæ legalis ac meriti per innocentiam; quia hæc ipsa sunt etiam peccata & mendacia merentia pœnam,* Phil. 3.7

3. *Ex-*

3. *Excluduntur etiam opera facta cum opinione meriti sine obedientia, & innocentia legali aut ex qualicunque imperfecta aut particulari obedientia cui aliqualiter detur (Merces citra imputationem secundum gratiam*, &c. So that this is all the exclusion of Works, that he acknowledgeth: and shews that *Bellarmine* is driven to this, which he approveth. §. 44. *Ex dictis hisce tribus modis, primo modo excluduntur vera opera legis, ita ut non adsint, licet deberent adesse primo creationis jure; posterioribus autem duobus modis excluduntur præsumpta opera ita ut non debeant adesse sed cavere potius; Et omnibus hisce modis opponitur inter se Lex operum, per quam relinquitur gloriatio homini, & Lex Fidei, per quam excluditur Gloriatio*, Rom. 3. 27.

Afterwards, one sense in which he saith *Fides sola justificat*, is this, *sola est fides quatenus opponitur legis operum obedientiæ; cujus veritas in nullo est hominum, opinio autem in nullo debet esse; & significat contrà obedientiam legis Fidei, seu præcepti, non de operando & expectando vitam ut mercedem debitam citra imputationem secundum gratiam; sed de credendo in Christum & accipiendo & Retinendo vitam gratiæ, & expectando vitam gloriæ, ut donum mere gratuitum per imputationem secundum gratiam in Christo, quem præposuit Deus placamentum in sanguine ipsius.*

And afterward, *Ex dictis facile intelligitur nihil his repugnare Augustinum, (qui præcipue nobis opponitur) cum docet, excludi tantum ab Apostolo opera facta sine fide & Spiritu Christi: (hoc est, sine viva fide promissionis, & abnegatione meriti proprii, sicut & Bellarm. supra docebat, excludi opera quibus id quod redditur est merces non gratia) opera vero facta cum fide & Spiritu Christi ad illam movente non excludi. Nam neque nos ea excludimus, ne sint, aut debeant esse; sed distinguit etiam Lutherus opera legis & opera Christi in nobis per fidem operantis & viventis per omnia. Additque hæc non posse magis omitti, quam ipsam fidem, nec esse minus necessaria quam fides*; *in li. de vot. mon. T. 2. Wit. f.* 281.

But the chief thing I intend is in the next words. *At quemadmodum cæteræ actiones significatæ per fidem quasi materialiter & Synecdochicè per se & directè non ordinantur ad amicitiam Dei & salutem propriè Efficiendam* (as he mistakingly thinks faith is) *sed vel ad fidem cui quoquo modo prosunt, vel ad amicitiam Dei*

& salutem saltem non amittendam: *ita neque Justificabunt & salvabunt propriè & directè. Proderunt tamen ad utrumque quatenus sunt, 1. vel dispositiones ad fidem, ut Pareus. 2. Effectus, &c. 3. Quatenus per illa excludimus & cavemus peccata & ingratitudinem, quæ omnino vera causa amittendæ Justitiæ & salutis futura essent: qualem causam removentem prohibens appellare, & ad causas per accidens referre solent. Omnis enim arbor quæ non*, &c. (Here he speaks only of the natural conducibility of works, and omitteth the moral conditionality; and so gives a causality *per accidens* to them, which is more then I do.) §. 54. *& in hac fructuum comparatione, sub notione propriè causæ finalis* (it was not then considered that justification is a continued Act) *pertinentis ad* non amittendum *sed* retinendum *gratuito data, ordo & respectus operum ad salutem simplicissimè, & commodissimè ad Scripturæ filum explicari potest. 2 Pet. 1. 10. 2 Joh. 8.*

Accordingly before in this Type he makes the conditions to be 1. Acceptation: (thats faith) 2. and retention: (this he sheweth is also by Gospel works) among divers allegations of his out of the *Apol. Ursin. Davenant, &c.* I will add one out of *Gualther* in 1 *Cor. hom.* 28. *Ut filius etsi hæres natus sit, abdicatur tamen, & ab hæreditate excidit, si se inobedientem & contumaciorem præbeat: ita nos quoque regni cælorum hereditatem, quæ ex adoptionis gratia nobis debetur, minime quidem nostris operibus meremur tandem vero nostra contumacia amittimus, & nostro magno merito abdicamur, si tantæ gratiæ iniqui simus æstimatores.*

And he reconcileth *Paul* and *James* thus, *f.* 56. *Deinque notandum est: alium esse loquendi & docendi modum contra Judaismum & contemptum gratiæ: alium contra securitatem & abusum gratiæ, cum disputatur præcipue contra Judaismum sive Justitiam operum, uti* Paulus *in ep. ad Rom. & alibi facit; tunc docemur sola fide Justificari, hoc est, nihil in nobis placere Deo nisi per abnegationem meriti & acceptationem contra doni Evangelici. At cum disputatur contra securitatem, & docetur quid respectu amicitiæ Divinæ nobis agendum sit (prout* Jacobus *in Epist. sua fecit, & hodiè, vel maxime necesse est* (we may truly say so) *ut Dr. Tossanus in sua Cont. Pseudevangelicos disputatione et alii piè ac prudenter jam pridem monuerunt) tunc negatur solam fidem sufficere,*

sufficere, & præcipiuntur omnia quæ quoquo modo prosunt: sive disponant ad fidem, sive in iis consummetur fides, (sicut quævis res fine & effectibus suis consummatur: arbor fructibus, potentiæ animæ motibus corporis, non quod ad essentiam sed quod ad usum) sive præsens jam amicitia per illa firmetur ne dissiliat, vel etiam augeatur quod ad effectus aliquos, & hoc modo quasi impleatur.

And he concludes thus. §. 53. *Uno verbo: sola fide justificamur: hoc est*: Nullo nostro merito, *sive ipsius fidei, sive alterius actionis præter fidem. Probetur evidenter & catholice meritum quale à nostris negatur, tunc etiam illud* præter solam fidem *admissuri sumus.*

Lud. Crocius saith, (*Synt. eg. l.* 4. pag 1123.) *Fides etiam sola justificat quatenus notat obedientiam quandam expectantem promissionem ut donum gratuitum; quomodo formaliter quidem consistit in applicatione promissionis, quam tamen & præcedunt dispositiones aliquæ ad hunc ipsum fidei actum, & sequuntur fructus: unde plures virtutes vel actus tum antecedentes tum consequentes connotat; & opponitur illi obedientiæ quæ non expectat promissionem tanquam donum omnino gratuitum, sed ut mercedem propositam sub conditione operis alicujus præter* acceptationem *&* gratitudinem debitam *quæ sua natura in omni donatione quamvis gratuitâ requiri solet. Et hujusmodi obedientia peculiariter* Opus *ab Apostolo, & Latinis propriè meritum dicitur. Et qui hâc conditione obediunt* operantes *vocantur*, Rom. 4.4. and 11.6. *Atque si ita hæc propositio exponatur, ea quidem opera quæ cum fide consistere nequeant, id est, quæ fiunt cum fiducia & opinione meriti, prorsus excluduntur, ita ut non solum negentur justificare, sed & adesse tam in justificato, quàm in justificando.*

Joh. Crocius *de justif. disp.* 13. pag. 673. *Credenti facta est promissio, fide accepturum remissionem peccatorum: mendico & ægro non est facta promissio, si ille manum extendat, datum iri eleemosynam; si iste pharmacum manu capiat convaliturum, &c.*

Mr. Gataker *against Saltmarsh shadows, &c.* pag. 26. 40 41, 43, 44, 45, 46 47, 48, 49, 53, 64. *doth fully give as* much to Faith, Repentance, Obedience as I do. *Nor know I any reason why,* (Johns) *Baptism for the substance of it, should not be an example*

to

to us also in these times, being the Baptism of Repentance unto Remission of sins, that is, if I mistake not, Baptism obsigning remission of sins upon condition of Repentance. pag. 40.] and *pag.* 41. He saith, [*that pardon of sin and salvation are propounded and preached upon condition of Faith, Repentance, and Newness of life, which are the conditions of the Gospel: and yet may they also be so termed as conditions of peace upon agreement unto, and performance whereof peace may be had, which otherwise cannot be obtained.*] And he evinceth this by an Argument drawn from the definition or nature of a condition, thus, [*That which is so propounded, as that being performed, life and salvation may undoubtedly be attained, and without which it cannot be had, may well be termed a condition: but such are the things before mentioned; therefore they may justly be termed conditions*] vid. ult. and p. 48. *Suppose a King be content at the suit either of the parties themselves, or any friend, to grant his gracious pardon to a company of notorious Rebels that had risen up against him,* &c. *upon condition that they acknowledge their offence, and their sorrow for it, with purpose and promise of living loyally for time to come; whether would you deem this to be free grace or no?* &c. *Were he not a most ungracious wretch, that having his pardon on such terms granted and signed him, should in regard of those conditions deny it to be of free Grace? and whether they do not blaspheme Gods free Grace, that deny it to be free Grace, if it be propounded on terms of Belief, Repentance and Amendment of life. Sir, Whatsoever you say to us, take heed how you tell Christ, that he doth not freely save you, if he will not save you unless you believe, &c.*] In many more places, and more fully Mr. *Gataker* shews that Faith, Repentance, Obedience, are jointly conditions of Pardon, *&c.* Only he gives Faith a *peculiar Receptivity*, which I never denyed: And he yields to call it an Instrument, which so largely taken, I will not contend against. But still I say that this Receptivity is but the aptitude of Faith in a special manner to this work of justifying: and the rest are apt to be conditions in their place, or else God would not have made them conditions. Even in regard of its natural aptitude and use [*Humiliation*, (as Mr. *Vines* saith, Serm. on *James* 4.8. pag. 12.) *though it do not properly cleanse the hands, yet it plucks off the Gloves, and*

makes

[illegible] them bare for washing : and Godly sorrow with its seven Daughters, 2 Cor. 7. 11. *are clensing things.*

Dr. Stoughton, *Righteous mans plea for Happ.* Serm. 6. pag. 32. *Faith comprehends not only the Act of the Understanding, but the Act of the Will too, so as the Will doth embrace and adhere, and cleave to those Truths which the understanding conceives : and not only embracing meerly by Assent to the Truth of it, but by closing with the Good of it :* (What is that but loving ?) *tasting and relishing it. As faith in Christ is not only the Assenting of a mans mind that Christ is the Saviour, but a resultancy of the Will on Christ as a Saviour, embracing of him, and loving, esteeming and honouring him as a Saviour. The Scripture comprehends both these together, and there is a rule for it, which the* Rabbins *give for the opening of the Scripture,* viz. *Verba sensus etiam denotant affectus, as* Jo. 17. 3. *This is eternal life to know thee,* &c. *it is not bare Knowledge the Scripture means, but Knowledge joined with affections.*] You see Dr. *Stoughton* took Love to be full as near Kin to Faith as I do. Many the like and more full in him I pass. I cited in my Append. *Alstedius, Junius, Pareus, Scharpius, Aretius, Ball,* &c. making *Faith, & Obedience, & Gratitude Conditions of the new Covenant* (& who saith not the same?) If all these be *homiletical and popular,* I much mistake them; which yet I cite not as if no words might be found in any of these Authors that seem to speak otherwise; but to shew that I am not wholly singular, (Though if I were, I cannot help it when I will.)

On the next Q. *Whether a dying man may look on his Faith and Obedience, & Duty as the condition of the N. Cov. by him performed ?* You would perswade me that I cannot think that I speak to the point in this: but you are mistaken in me: for I can mistake more then that comes to; and indeed I yet think I spoke as directly to the question in your terms laid down, as was possible : for I changed not one of your terms, but mentioned the Affirmative as your self expressed it : If you did mean otherwise then you spoke, I knew not that, nor can yet any better understand you. Only I can feel that all the difference between you and me must be decided by distinguishing of [*Conditions* :] but you never yet go about it so as I can understand you. You here ask me, [*Whether I think you deny a godly life to be a comforta-*

ble Testimony, or necessary qualification of a man for pardon?]
Answer. 1. But the Question is not of the *significancy* or *Testimony*, nor yet of all kind of qualification; that is an ambiguous term, and was not in the Question, but of the conditionality. 2. You yield to the term *Condition* your self elsewhere, and therefore need not shun it. 3. Qualifications and Conditions are either physical and remote, of which I raise no question: so the Essence of the soul is a condition, and so hearing the Gospel is a natural Condition of him that will understand it; and understanding is a natural Qualification of him that will believe it: For *ignoti nulla fides.* But it is another sort of conditions you know that we are in speech of, which I have defined, and Mr. *Gataker* before cited: *viz. Moral legal conditions* so called *in sensu forensi vel legali*: when the Law of Christ hangs our actual Justification and salvation on the doing or not doing such a thing. Yet do I very much distinguish between the Nature and Uses of the several Graces or Duties contained in the conditions; for though they are all conditions, yet they were not all for the same reason, or to the same use ordained to be conditions: but repentance in one sence as preparatory to faith: and Faith. 1. Because it honoureth Christ, and debaseth our selves. 2. Because it being in the full an Acceptation of the thing offered, is the most convenient means to make us Possessors without any contempt of the Gift; with other reasons that might be found: So I might assign the reasons (as they appear to us) why God hath assigned Love to Christ, and sincere Obebience, and forgiving others, their several parts and places in this conditionality; (but I have done it in my Aphorisms;) but then all these are drawn from the distinct nature and use of these duties Essentially in themselves considered, which is but their Aptitude for the place or conditionality which they are appointed to, and would of themselves have done nothing without such appointment. So that it is one question to ask, *Why doth Faith or Works of Obedience to Christ justifie?* (To which I answer; Because it was the pleasure of God to make them the conditions of the Covenant, and not because of their own nature directly:) and its another Question, *Why did God choose Faith to the Precedency in this work?* To which I answer. 1. Properly there is no cause of Gods actions without himself. 2. But speaking

ing

ing of him after the manner of men, as we must do, it is because Faith is fitter then any other Grace for this Honor and Office, as being both a high honouring of God, by believing him (thats as for Assent) and in its own Essential nature, a hearty thankfull Acceptance of his Son, both to be our Lord (which is both for the Honor of God and our own good) and our Saviour to deliver and glorifie us: and so is the most rational way that man can imagine to make us partakers of the procured happiness, without either our own danger (if a heavier condition had been laid upon us) or the dishonour of the Mediator: either by diminishing the estimation of the favour (if we had done any more to the procuring it our selves) or by contempt of the Gift, (if we had not been required and conditioned with so much as thankfully and lovingly to accept it.) And then if the Question be, *Why God hath assigned sincere Obedience and Perseverance therein to that place of secondary Conditionality for the continuance and consummation of Justification, and for the attaining of salvation?* I answer. Not because they have any such Receptive nature as faith, but because Faith being an Acceptance of Christ as Lord also, and delivering and resigning up the soul to him accordingly in Covenant, this Duty is therefore necessarily implyed, as the thing promised by us in that Covenant, and so in some sence greater then the covenanting it self, or the end of it: and Christ never intended to turn man out of his service, and discharge him from Obedience; but to lay on him an easier and lighter yoak and burden, to learn of him, *&c.* and therefore well may he make this the condition of their finding Ease and Rest to their souls, *Mat.* 11.28, 29. For, for this end he dyed, that he might be Lord, *Rom.* 14.9. And therefore when we are freely pardoned, & bought from hell, it is equal that Christ should rule us, who bought us, and that his Covenant hang till the continuance of our Legal title to pardon justification, and glory, and so the full possession of them upon this perseverance in sincere loving grateful subjection to him that bought us, and by him to the Father. And thus Sir, I have digressed and used many words on this, (which to you I think needless) not only because I perceive that you acknowledge the conditionality of obedience in some sense, but tell me

not in what sense, but lest you should not discern my sense, who desire to speak as plain as I can, that you may truly see wherein we differ: And that I also may see it when you have as clearly opened your meaning of your term, [*Qualifications.*]

And for your Question [*Whether a godly man can think the Righteousness of Christ made his by working, or only believing.*] I answer, causally and efficiently by neither, I think, (though you think otherwise); I dare not so advance faith, and so advance man. I remember good, old, learned, solid *Gatakers* words to *Saltmarsh* (*pag.* 53,) *It is your self rather then any of us that trip at this stone, when you would have faith so much pressed in the Doctrine of salvation, in regard of the gloriousness and eminency of the grace it self; which to assert, is not sound: (sic in Animadv. in Lucium part.* 1. §. 9. *v.* 7.) The righteousness of Christ is made ours by Gods free gift; but faith and true subjection are conditions of our participation; and what interest each hath in the conditionality, and on what grounds, I have shewed. I fear you give too much to faith and man.

You ask [*Is it repent, and Christs righteousness by this is made yours?*] *Answer*, It is oftimes, *Repent and be forgiven; and repent and be baptized; and repent and believe, and be forgiven*: but not *efficiently by repenting* nor *believing*: but on *condition* of both: though in ordaining them conditions God might intend one but as preparative or subservient to the other; and not on equal terms, or to equal use immediately.

And when you say, [*that the dying Christian is directed to the Resting on Christ, and eying the brazen Serpent, not to be found in any thing but a righteousness by faith,*] I never durst entertain any doubt of this; it is no question between us: only in what sense it is called a Righteousness by faith, I have shewed; even in opposition to Works in *Pauls* sense, which make the reward to be of debt and not of Grace, *Rom.* 4. 4. where you say [*It is an Act of Dependance not of Obedience that interests us in Christs Righteousness*] I answer, It is no one Act but many; It is an act of *Assent* first (and thence the whole hath the name of faith, it being so hard a thing to believe supernatural things, as it would have been to us to believe Christ to have been God when we had seen him in the shape

ſhape of man, had we lived in thoſe times, when the Doctrine of faith came not with thoſe advantages as now it doth.) And then it is an act of willing, conſenting, electing, affecting (which three are but a *velle Reſpectivum*, and ſo in the act all one): and this in order of nature goes before any act which you can in any reaſonable propriety call Dependance: and I doubt not are far more eſſential to juſtifying faith: yet I am heartily willing to take your acts of dependance (for thoſe alſo are more then one) in the next place. But it confoundeth and abuſeth us and the Church in this controverſie, that many learned Divines will needs ſhun the ſtrict Philoſophical names of the ſeveral Acts of the ſoul, and overlook alſo the natural order of the ſouls motions, and they will uſe, and ſtil uſe the Metaphorical expreſſions, as *apprehenſion* (improper) *dependance*, *relying*, *reſting*, *recombency*, *adherence*, *embracing*, with more the like. I know Scripture uſeth ſome of theſe: but then it is not in ſtrict diſputing, as *Joh. Crocius* tels *Bellarm.* we may uſe *apprehend* figuratively, becauſe Scripture ſaith, *apprehendite diſciplinam*, and lay hold on eternal life: But this would quickly end diſputation, or elſe make it endleſs. Yet in the places cited, who knows not the ſame word hath different ſenſes? in the former being uſed for to accept and ſtoop to: in the later for an earneſt preſſing on, and endeavouring after as a runner to catch the prize. And they will be loth to ſay, theſe are all and each of them the juſtifying acts.

And where you add that *its not an act of obedience.* I anſwer, 1. I would you had firſt anſwered the many Scriptures to the contrary produced in my Aphor. 2. Its true of the firſt intereſt in Chriſt, (further then faith is called obedience) but not of the further continued and conſummate intereſt. 3. Doth not Chriſt ſay, *Take my yoak, learn of mè to be meek and lowly*, that they *may have eaſe and reſt*? *Eaſe and Reſt*? From what? Why from what they came burdened with? and that was ſure *guilt and curſe*, and what ever is oppoſed to *pardon and juſtification*, *Mat.* 11. *And Bleſſed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in, &c. Rev.* 22. 14. And *he is the Author of eternal ſalvation to all them that obey him*, *Heb.* 5. 9. And *Mat.* 25. is wholly

and convincingly againſt you. And ſo is the ſecond *Pſalm* wholly, which makes ſubjection to Chriſt as King, the great part of the Goſpel condition. [*Kiſs the Son*] conteineth more then *Recombency*, in my judgement: and yet no more then that true faith which is the condition of juſtification.

But no word in your paper brings me to ſuch a ſtand as your next, where you ſay, *And that is very harſh ſtill which you expreſs, to expect the Righteouſneſs of the Covenant of Grace upon the conditions fulfilled by your ſelf, through Gods workings.*] Anſw. Truly it is quite beyond my ſhallow capacity to reach what you here mean to be ſo harſh: what ſhould I imagine? That there are conditions upon which the Tenor of the Goſpel gives Chriſt Righteouſneſs, you acknowldge: And that he that performeth them not, the Goſpel giveth him none of it: I know you confeſs theſe; And that we muſt needs perform them our ſelves, through Gods workings (*i. e.* both enablement and excitation, and co-operation:) I know you doubt of none of theſe; for you have wrote againſt the *Antinomians*: and Mr. *Gataker* hath evinced the ſottiſh ignorance or impudency of *Saltmarſh*, in denying Faith, Repentance and Obedience to be the conditions on which, performed by us, we muſt enjoy the things promiſed, Pardon, *&c.* or elſe not. Yea in this paper you yield to this conditionality. What then is the matter? Is it harſh when yet you never once ſhew the fault of the Speech? It muſt be either the falſhood, or the unfitneſs; but you have yet accuſed it of neither: and yet ſay it is harſh.

But the reaſon you intimate, becauſe *Bellarmine* hath ſome ſuch phraſe: which I never remembred or obſerved in him: and little do I care whether he have or no: If the *Papiſts* be nearer to us then I take them to be, it is cauſe of joy and not ſorrow: But ſure I am that Proteſtant Writers generally uſe the word *Condition*; and *Wendeline* ſaith, The *Papiſts* abuſe us in feigning us to ſay the *Goſpel is abſolute*; and ſaith, the *Goſpel in each ſence is conditional. In one ſence Faith is the Condition*; *in another, Faith and Obedience, &c.*

But here you come again to the Labyrinth and tranſcendent Myſterie of *paſſive Faith*: nay you enlarge the Myſterie yet more: 1. You ſay again, [*Faith doth* pati. 2. *And yet Love doth*

doth agere. 3. *Else you would yield that* Bellarmine *argues consonantly enough, that Love would justifie as well as Faith.* 4. *Yet you acknowledge Faith an Active Grace: but only in this Act its meerrecipient.*

Answer. I confess my reason utterly at a loss in this; but yet if it were in my Bible (to me Intelligible) I would believe it as I do the Doctrine of the Trinity, and cease enquiring. But I cannot so do by any Creature, to make him the Lord of my faith and Reason. 1. Whether Faith doth *Pati*, I have enquired already. 2. That Love doth *Agere*, I verily believe: and yet I have oster heard Love called a *Passion*, then *Faith*: And as *Keckeram* saith, *the Affections are more Passive then the immanent Elicit Acts of the Intellect and Will.* And though as it is in the Rational soul, Love, (saith *Aquin.*) is no *Passion*, but a *Willing* (which causeth me to judge it so near Kin to Faith) yet as it is in the sensitive, it is a *Passion*. So that I am quite beyond doubt that physically love is more properly called a Passion then Faith. 3. Therefore for ought I know, it is no wonder if *Bellarmine* bear the Bell, and Papists be unconvinced, if you have no better Arguments then this; especially if no body else had better. 4. But yet the Mysterie is far more unsearchable to me, that *faith should be Active in all other, save only this Act.* What is this thing called *Faith*, which you make such a *Proteus*, to be *Active* and *Passive* as to several Objects? Yea when it is acknowledged the same *Faith*, which receiveth Christ and Righteousness, and the several promises, and resteth on Christ for the Pardon of each sin, for hearing each Prayer, for Assurance, Peace, Comfort, Deliverance from temptations, and dangers and sin, and is thus usefull through all our lives, for the fetching of help from Christ in every streight, yet that this same Faith should be *Active* in all the Rest, and *Passive* only in One justifying Act. Oh, For the face of an Argument to prove this! Sure its natural Reception of one Object and another is in point of *Passiveness* alike: and its assigned *Conditionality* in Scripture, is of like nature as to each branch of the good on that condition promised. 5. And here also I perceive by your speech you make it consist in some single act. And yet you never tell what that is; and how then can it be in several faculties,

culties, as *Davenant*, *Amesius*, *Joh. Crocius*, *Melancth.* with most do affirm? 6. But yet the depth of the mysterie to me lies in understanding and reconciling your words, [*Only in this Act its meerly Recipient.*] Is this an *Act* too? and yet *meerly Recipient?* (which you make a *meer Passive reception.*) *A meerly Passive Act* is such a contradiction *in adjecto* to my understanding, that I cannot welcome the notion thither; yea if you had said less, that it is an *Act in any Part or Degree Passive.* I never knew that an Act could *Pati*; yet am I more conscious of mine own insufficiency, then to contend with one of your knowledge in matter of Philosophy; but I must needs say that your notions are yet so far beyond my reach, that possibly I might take the words as true upon the credit of one whom I so highly value, yet am I not able to apprehend the sence.

The Joy in Heaven which you mention for a *wandring sheep*, I think is meant of the first, or some eminent recovery to Christ, and not of every Philosophical notion: sure, Sir, if salvation hang on this Doctrine, as thus by you explained, I am out of hope that either I or ever a one in all this countrey should ever come to heaven; except by believing as that part of the Church believes which is of your opinion: When I am yet apt to think, that siding with any party in such opinions will not conduce to any mans salvation: For I am of *Bergius* his mind, that as it is not the Jew, the Pagan, or the Mahometan, or any Infidel, *(privative,)* that shall be saved, but the Christian; so it is not the *Papist*, *the Lutheran*, *the Calvinist*, *the Arminian*, *that shall be saved (qua talis) but the Catholick.* However I am in strong hopes that a man may be saved, though he cannot understand how an *Act can be a passive instrument*; nor do I think that my subscribing to that notion, would make any great rejoycing in Heaven.

I am sorry you had not leisure to answer the Questions, which were very pertinent to the business of my satisfaction, though not to your business.

That my explication of that plain, weighty, necessary point, *how imperfect graces or duties can yet be the conditions of the New Covenant*, should seem a Paradox *to you*, I say, *to you*, makes me yet more possest with admiration; When you know that such

such conditions there are (suppose it were but faith alone:) and you know your self that this faith is imperfect. But I perceive we know but in part, and therefore must differ in part. He shall see whom God will enlighten. I had far rather you had fallen upon that point then on the term of *Justification by works*. If you would but grant me, that *Justifying faith, as such, is an Accepting of Christ for King, and Prophet as well as for a Justifier, and consequently that it is a resigning our selves to be ruled by him, as well as to be saved by him*, I shall then be content for peace sake to lay by the phrase of *Justification by works*, though it be Gods own phrase, if the Church were offended with it, and required this at my hands: (So they will be satisfied with my silencing it, without a renouncing it.) I have written thus largely, that I might not be obscure, and to let you see, that though I have scarce time to eate or sleeep, yet I have time and paper for this work, and that I make not light of your dissent. The Love and Respect which you mention to me I do as little doubt of, as I do whether I have a heart in my breast: and your desires of my reducing I know do proceed from your zeal and sincere affections. That which I take worst is, that you should so desire me not to take it ill to be called an erring shepherd: As if I did not know my Proneness to err, and were not conscious of the weakness of my understanding: or as if the expressions of so sincere love did need excuse; or as if I were so tender and brittle as not to endure so gentle a touch: as if my confidence of your love were *Plumea, non Plumbea*, and would be blown away with such a friendly breath! Certainly Sir, your sharper smiting would be precious Balm, so it light not on the Truth, but me! I am not so unctuous, nitrous, or sulfureous, as to be kindled with such a gratefull warmth. My Intellect were too much active, and my affections too passive, if by the reception of the beams of such favourable expressions, my soul as by a Burning-Glass should be set on fire. I am oft ashamed and amazed to think of the horrid intolerable Pride of many learned Pious Divines, who though they have no worse Titles then *Viri docti, reverendi, celeberrimi*: yet think themselves abused and unsufferably vilified, if any word do but *acrius pungere*, or any Argument do *faucibus premere* (witness *Rivet* and *Spanhemius* late angry censure of *Amyraldus*) Can

we be fit Preachers and Patterns of meekneſs and humility to our people, who are ſo notoriouſly proud, that we can ſcarce be ſpoke to? My knowledge of your eminent humility and gentelneſs hath made me alſo the freer in my ſpeeches here to you: which therefore do need more excuſe then yours: And I accordingly intreat you, if any thing have paſſed that is unmannerly, according to the natural eagerneſs and vehemency of my temper, that you will be pleaſed to excuſe what may be excuſed, and the reſt to remit and cover with love, aſſuring your ſelf it proceeds not from any diminution of his high eſteem of you, and love to you, who acknowledgeth himſelf unfeignedly ſo very much below you, as to be unworthy to be called

Your fellow-ſervant

RICHARD BAXTER.

June 28. 1650.

Kederminſter.

Poſtſcript.

Postscript.

DEar Sir, while I was waiting for a messenger to send this by, Master *Brooksby* acquaints me, that you wisht him to tell me, that I must expect no more in writing from you. My request is, that whereas you intimated in your first, a purpose of writing somewhat against me on this subject hereafter, you would be pleased to do it in my life time, that I may have the benefit of it, if you do it satisfactorily; and if not, may have opportunity to acquaint you with the reasons of my dissent. *Scribunt Asinium Pollionem dixisse aliquando se parasse orationes contra Plancum, quas non nisi post mortem esset editurus; & Plancum respondisse, cum mortuis non nisi larvas luctari: ut Lud. Vives ex Plinio, & Dr. Humfred. ex illo Jesuit.* 2. *p.* 640.

Also I request that if possible you would proceed on such terms as your Divinity may not wholly depend upon meer niceties of Philosophy: For I cannot think such points to be neer the foundation: Or at least that you will clearly and fully confirm your Philosophical grounds: For as I find that your Doctrine of a Passive Instrumentality of the Act of faith (and that in a Mo-

ral reception of righteousness which is but a relation, yet calling it Physical) is the very bottom of the great distance between us in the point of justification: So I am of opinion that I may more freely dissent from a brother in such *tricis philosophicis* then in an Article of faith: Especially having the greatest Philosophers on my side; and also seeing how little accord there is among themselves, that they are almost so many men, so many minds: and when I find them professing as *Combacchius in præf. ad Phys.* that they write against their own sense to please others, (*& quod maximam opinionum in lib. contentarum partem non jam probaret*; *& Aristotelem non esse normam veritates*, and wishing *ut tandem aliquando exurgat aliquis qui perfectiora nobis principia monstret*: and to conclude as he, *falsitatem opinionum & sententiarum & scientiarum imperfectionem jam pridem video, sed in veritate docenda deficio. Et Nulli aut paucis certe minus me satisfacturum ac mihi ipsi sat scio.* And how many new Methods and Doctrines of Philosophy this one age hath produced? And I am so far sceptical my self herein, as to think with *Scaliger* (*ibid cit.*) *Nos instar vulpis à Ciconia delusæ vitreum vas lambere, pultem haud attingere.* But I believe not that in any Master point in Divinity, God hath left his Church at such an utter loss, nor hanged the faith and salvation of every honest ordinary Christian, upon meer uncertain Philosophical speculations. I do not think that *Paul* knew what a *Passive instrument was*; much less [*an act that was physically passive in its instrumentality in a meral causation.*] You must give me leave to remain confident that *Paul* built not his Doctrine of justification on such a philosophical foundation;

tion, till you have brought one Scripture to prove that faith is an instrument, and such an instrument; which can neither be done. Especially when the same *Paul* professeth that he came not to declare the Testimony of God, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας: and that he determined not to know any thing among them save Iesus Christ and him crucified; and that his speech and preaching was not ἐν πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις) that so their faith might not stand ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων: & that he spoke the mysteries of the Gospel οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, ἁγίου; πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, 1 *Cor.* 2. I am past doubt therefore that to thrust such Philosophical dictates into our Creed or Confession, and make them the very touchstone of Orthodoxnes in others, is a dangerous presumptuous adding to the Doctrine of the Gospel, and a making of a new Doctrine of justification and salvation, to the great wrong of the Prophet and Lawgiver of the Church.

I was even now reading learned *Zanchius* proof that believers before Christ did by their faith receive Christs flesh, or humane nature (as promised and future) as well as the Divine, and his heavy censure of the contrary Doctrine, as vile and unsufferable; which occasioneth me to add this Quere, Whether that believing was a physical reception, when the object had no real being or did not exist? Or whether meer morral reception (by Accepting, Chooſing, Consenting) as a people receiving the Kings Heires for their future Governours before they are born; or as we receive a man for our King, who dwels far out of our sight; Or as Princes wives do use to take them both for their Husbands and Soveraign Lords, even

in their own Native Countrey, before they come to sight of the man; the match being both driven on and made, and the marriage or contract performed and imperfectly solemnized at that distance by an Embassador or Delegate: just so do we receive Christ, (whose humane nature is far off, and his Divine out of our sight) to be our Saviour, Soveraign (by redemption) and Husband; even here in our native Country; the match being moved to us by his Embassadors, and imperfectly solemnized upon our cordial consent, and giving up our selves to him by our Covenant: (but it shall be perfectly solemnized at the great Marriage of the Lamb.) This is my faith of the nature of true justifying faith; and the manner of its receiving Christ.

THE

THE Reader must understand that after this, I had a personal conference with this Dear and Reverend Brother, wherein he still owned and insisted on the passiveness of Justifying faith, viz. That it is but a Grammatical action, (or nominal) and a physical, or hyperpyhsical passion; which also he giveth us again in the Treatise of Imputation of righteousness.

FINIS.

A

DISPVTATION,

Proving the Neceſsity of a two-fold Righteouſneſs to *Juſtification* and *Salvation*.

And defending this and many other Truths about Iuſtifying Faith, its Object and Office, againſt the confident, but dark Aſſaults of Mr. *Iohn Warner*.

By *Richard Baxter*.

Acts 5. 31.

Him hath God axalted with his right hand, a Prince and a Saviour, to give Repentance unto Iſrael, *and forgiveneſs of ſins.*

Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24, 25.

And therefore it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs: Now it was not written for his ſake alone that it was Imputed to him; but for us alſo, to whom it ſhall be Imputed, if we Believe on him that raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raiſed again for our Juſtification.

LONDON,

Printed by *R. W.* for *Nevil Simmons*, Book ſeller in *Kederminſter*, and are to be ſold by him there, and by *Nathaniel Ekins*, at the Gun in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1658.

DISPUTATION,

Proving the Necessity of a two-fold Righteousness to Justification and Salvation.

Shewing the Nature of both, and many other Truths about Justifying Faith, its Object and Office, against the contrary Errors of

By Herbert Baxter.

LONDON

Printed by [illegible] Book-seller in Re-

[illegible]

Queſtion. *Whether Beſides the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt Imputed, there be a Perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs neceſſary to Juſtification and Salvation?* Affirm.

THough it hath pleaſed a late Opponent (Mr. *Warner*) to make the Defence of this Propoſition neceſſary to me; yet I ſhall ſuppoſe that I may be allowed to be brief, both becauſe of what I have formerly ſaid of it, and becauſe the Queſtion is ſo eaſily decided, and Chriſtians are ſo commonly agreed on it.

For the right underſtanding of what we here maintain, its neceſſary that I explain the Terms, and remove confuſion by ſome neceſſary diſtinctions, and lay down my ſenſe in ſome Propoſitions that make to the opening of this.

To trouble you with the Etymologies of the words in ſeveral Languages that ſignifie *Righteouſneſs* or *Juſtification* would be a needleſs loſs of time, it being done to our hands by ſo many, and we being ſo far agreed on it, that here lyeth no part of our preſent controverſie.

The Form of Righteousnes, signified by the name is *Relative*, as *strait* or *crooked* is. (For it is not the Habit of Justice, by which we give every man his own, that is the Subject of our Question, but Righteousnes in a Judicial or Legal sense) 1. *Righteousnes* is either of the *cause*, or of the *person*. Not that these are subjects actually *separated* but *distinct*, the one being subordinate to the other. The *cause* is the neareſt subject, and so far as *it* is *just* and *justifiable*, so far the *person* is *just* and *justifiable*. Yet the person may *otherwise* be just and justified, when one or many causes are unjustifyable.

2. *Righteousnes* is denominated either from a Relation to the *Precept* of the Law, or to the *Sanction*. To be *righteous* in Relation to the *Precept*, is to be *conform* to that *Precept*; An *Action* or *Disposition* conform to the Precept, is called a Righteous Action or Disposition: and from thence the *person* being so far conform, is called a *Righteous person*: And so this *Righteousnes*, as to the *positive precept*, is his *obeying it*; and as to the *prohibition*, it is his *Innocency*, contrary to that *guilt*, which we call *Reatus culpæ*.

Righteousnes as a Relation to the *Sanction*, is either a Relation to the *Commination* and penal Act of the Law, or to the *promissory* or Premiant Act. As to the former, *Righteousnes* is nothing, but the *Not-dueness of the punishment*, contrary to the *Reatus pœnæ*, as it respects the *execution*; and so *A not being lyable to condemnation*, as it respects the *sentence*. This is sometime founded in the persons *Innocency* last mentioned: sometime on a *free pardon* or acquittance: sometime on *satisfaction* made by himself: And sometime on *satisfaction by another*, conjunct with free pardon (which is our case.)

Righteousnes as a Relation to the *Promise*, or Premiant part of the Sanction, is nothing but our *Right* to the *Reward*, *Gift*, or *Benefit*, as *pleadable* and *justifyable in foro*. Which sometime is founded in merit of our own; sometime in a free Gift: sometime in the *merit of another, conjunct with free Gift*, which is our case, (other cases concern us not) This last mentioned, is *Righteousnes* as a Relation to the *substance* of the *Promise* or Gift: But when the *Promise*, or *Gift*, or *Testament*, or Premiant Law is *conditional*, as in our case it is, then there is another sort of

Righte-

Righteousness necessary, which is Related to the *Modus promissionis*, and that is, *The performance of the condition*: which if it be not properly called Righteousness *Ethically*, yet *civilly* in a *Judiciary* sense it is, when it comes to be the cause to be tryed and Judged, whether the person have performed the condition, then his cause is just or unjust, and he just or unjust in that respect.

3. *Righteousness* is either *Universal*, as to all causes that the person can be concerned in: or it is only *particular*, as to some causes only, and so but *secundum quid* to the person.

4. A *particular Righteousness* may either be such as the total welfare of a man depends on; or it may be of less and inconsiderable moment.

5. When a *cause subordinate* to the *main cause* is *Righteous*, this may be called a *subordinate Righteousness*. But if it be *part* of the *main cause*, it is a *partial righteousness co-ordinate*.

I will not trouble you with so exact a disquisition of the Nature of Righteousness and Justification as I judge fit in it self, both because I have a little heretofore attempted it, and because I find it blamed as puzling curiosity or needless distinguishing: Though I am not of that mind, yet I have no minde to be troublesome.

As for the term *Justification*, 1. It either may signifie the *Act of the Law or Promise*: or the *sentence of the Judge*: or the *Execution of that sentence*; For to one of these three sences the word may still be reduced, as we shall have to do with it; that is, to *constitutive*, or *sentential*, or *Executive Justification*; though the *sentence* is most properly so called. To these, *Justification* by *Plea*, *Witness*, &c. are *subservient*.

2. *Justification* is either opposed to a *false* Accusation, or to a *true*.

3. In our case, Justification is either according to the *Law* of *works*, or to the *Law* of *Grace*.

I think we shall at this time have no great need to use any more distinctions then these few, and therefore I will add no more about this Term.

As to the term [*Evangelical*] Righteousness may be so called in a four-fold sense. 1. Either because it is that *righteous-*

neſs which the *Covenant* or Law of *Grace* requireth as its *Condition*; Or 2. Becauſe its a Righteouſneſs *revealed* by the *Goſpel*; Or 3. Becauſe it is *Given* by the *Goſpel*; 4. Or becauſe it is a *perfect fulfilling of the Precepts* of the *Goſpel*.

By [*a perſonal*] Righteouſneſs, we mean here, not that which is ours by meer *Imputation*, but that which is founded in ſomewhat Inherent in us, or performed by us.

[*Neceſſity*] is 1. of a meer *Antecedent*. 2. Or of a *Means*: We mean the laſt. *Means* are either *cauſes*, or *conditions*.

I ſhall now by the help of theſe few diſtinctions give you the plain truth in ſome Propoſitions, both Negatively and Affirmatively, as followeth.

Propoſition 1. *It is confeſſed by all that know themſelves, or man and the Law, that none of us have a* Perſonal univerſal Righteouſneſs. *For then there were no ſin, nor place for confeſſion, or pardon, or Chriſt.*

Prop. 2. *And therefore we muſt all confeſs, that in regard of the* Preceptive *part of the* Law of works *We are all* unjuſt, *and cannot be juſtified by the* deeds of the Law, *or by* our works.

Prop. 3. *And in regard of the* Commination *of* that Law, *We are all under* guilt *and the* Curſe, *and are the children of wrath, and therefore cannot be juſtified by* that Law, *or by* our works. *Both theſe are proved by* Paul *at large, ſo that none have a perſonal Legal Righteouſneſs.*

Prop. 4. *No man can plead any* proper ſatisfaction *of his own for the pardon of ſin, and eſcaping the curſe of the Law: But only* Chriſts Satisfaction, *that fulfilled the Law, and became a curſe for us.*

Prop. 5. *No man can plead any* merit *of his own for procuring the* Reward (*unleſs as actions, that have the promiſe of a Reward, are under Chriſt improperly called* merits) *But our righteouſneſs of this ſort is only the* merit and purchaſe *of Chriſt, and the* free gift *of the Goſpel in him.*

Prop. 6. *We have* no one work *that is* perfectly juſtifiable *by the perfect precepts of the Law of Works: And therefore We have no* legal perſonal Righteouſneſs *at all that can properly be ſo called*; *but are all* corrupt and become abominable, *there being* none that doth

doth good, no not one; Imperfect legal righteousnes, *is an improper speech; it is properly* no *legal righteousnes at all, but a less degree of unrighteousnes (The more to blame they that call sanctification so.)*

Prop. 7. *No man can say that he is a* Co-ordinate Con-cause *with Christ in his Justification; or that he hath the least degree of a* satisfactory *or* Meritorious Righteousnes, *which may bear any part in* co-ordination *with Christs righteousnes, for his justification or salvation.*

Prop. 8. *We have not any* personal Evangelical Righteousnes *of* perfect obedience *to the* Precepts *of Christ himself: whether it be the Law of Nature as in his hand, or the Gospel positives.*

Prop. 9. *Even the* Gospel *personal Righteousnes of* outward works, *though but in* sincerity, *and not perfection, is not necessary (no not as an antecedent) to our Justification at the first.*

Prop. 10. External *works of* Holiness *are not of absolute necessity to Salvation: for it is possible that death may suddenly after Conversion, prevent opportunity: and then the inward faith and repentance will suffice: Though I think no man can give us one instance of such a man* de facto: *not the thief on the cross: for he confessed prayed, reproved the other,* &c.

Prop. 11. *Where* sincere Obedience *is* Necessary *to* Salvation; *it is not* all the same Acts *of obedience that are of Necessity* to all men, *or* at all times: *for the* Matter *may vary, and yet the* sincerity *of obedience continue. But* some special *Acts are of* Necessity *to the* sincerity.

Prop 12. *If* Righteousnes *be denominated from the* Precept, *Christs* Obedience *was a perfect legal* Righteousnes, *as having a perfect conformity to the Law: But not so in* Evangelical Righteousnes: *for he gave us many Laws for the application of his Merits, that he was neither obliged to fulfill, nor capable of it. If Righteousnes be denominated from the* Promise *or precious part of the Law, Christs righteousnes was in some sort the righteousnes of the Law of works, (for he merited all the reward of that Law;) But it was principally the* righteousnes *of the* special Covenant of Redemption *(between the Father and him;) but not of the Covenant of* Grace *made with* man *(he did not repent or obey for pardon and salvation to himself as a Believer;)*

If Righteousnes *be denominated from the* Comminatory *or penal part of the Law, then Christs* sufferings *were neither a* strictly legal *or an* Evangelical righteousnes. *For the Law required the* supplicium ipsius delinquentis, *and knew no Surety or Substitute. But* thus *Christs* sufferings *were a* Pro-Legal-righteousnes, *as being not the* fulfilling *of the* Threatening, *but a* full Satisfaction *to the* Law-giver, *(which was equivalent) and so a valuable consideration, why the Law should* not be fulfilled *(by our damnation) but* dispensed with *(by our pardon) So that the Commination was the cause of Christs sufferings; and he suffered materially the same sort of Death which the Law threatened. But most strictly his sufferings were a* Righteous fulfilling his part of the Covenant of Redemption with the Father : *But in no propriety were they the fulfilling of the* Commination *of the* Law of Grace, *against the Despisers or neglecters of Grace. I mean that proper to the Gospel.*

Prop. 13. *Christs righteousnes is well called our* Evangelical Righteousnes, *both as it is* Revealed *by the* Gospel, *and* conferred *by it, and opposed to the legal way of Justification by perfect personal Righteousnes. So that by calling our own personal righteousnes*, Evangelical, *we deny not that Title to Christs, but give it* that in *a higher respect, and much more.*

Prop. 14. *No personal righteousnes of ours, our faith or repentance, is any* proper cause *of our* first *Justification, or of our entering into a justifyed state : Though as they remove Impediments, or are Conditions, they may* improperly *be called causes; So much for the* Negative *Propositions.*

Affirm. Prop. 1. *That a Godly man hath a* particular righteousnes, *or may be* Just in a particular cause, *there is no man can deny : unless he will make him worse then the Devil : for if the Devil may be falsly accused or belyed, he is just in that particular cause.*

Prop. 2. *All Christians that I know do confess an* Inherent Righteousnes *in the Saints, and the necessity of this righteousnes to Salvation. So that this can be no part of our Controversie.*

Prop. 3. *Consequently all must confess that Christs righteousnes imputed, is not our* only *righteousnes. Yea, that the righteousnes*

ness of Pardon and Justification from sin, is no further necessary then men are sinners; and therefore the less need any man hath of it, the better he pleaseth Christ, that is, he had rather We would beware of sin as far as may be, then sin and fly to him for Pardon.

Prop. 4. *And we are agreed I think that the* personal Righteousnes *of the Saints is so much the end of Christs Redemption and Pardoning Grace, that the* perfection *of this is that* blessed state *to which he will bring them; so that when he hath done his work,* Sanctification *shall be perfect; but* Justification *by* Pardon *of further sins, shall* be no more: *Heaven cannot bear so imperfect a state.*

Prop. 5. *We are agreed therefore that our* Righteousnes of Sanctification, *or the Doctrine thereof is so far from being any derogation or dishonour to Christ, that it is the high honour which he intended in his Work of Redemption, that the Glory of God the Father, and of the Redeemer may everlastingly shine forth in the Saints, and they may be fit to love, and serve, and praise him,* Tit. 2.14.

Prop. 6. *It is past all doubt that this* Inherent Righteousnes *consisteth in a* true fulfilling of the Conditions of the Gospel-Promise, *and a* sincere Obedience to the Precepts of *Christ. And so hath a double respect:* one *to the Promise; and so it is* conditio præstita: *the other to the* Precept; *and so it is* Officium præstitum. *All* Conditions *here are* Duties: *but all* Duties are not the *Condition.*

Prop. 7. *I think we are agreed, that* Justification by Christ as Judge *at the great day, hath the very same* Conditions *as* Salvation *hath, it being an* adjudging us to Salvation. *And therefore that this personal* Evangelical Righteousnes *is of necessity to our* Justification *at that* Judgement.

Prop. 8. *And I think We are agreed that no man can* continue *in a* state *of Justification, that* continueth *not in a* state *of* Faith, *Sanctification, and sincere Obedience.*

Prop. 9. *We are agreed I am sure that no man at age is justified before he Repent and Believe.*

Prop. 10. *And we are agreed that this Repenting and Believing is both the matter of the* Gospel-Precept, *and the* Condition *of*

the Promiſe. *Chriſt hath made over to us himſelf with his imputed Righteouſneſs and Kingdom, on condition that we repent and believe in him.*

Prop. 11. *It cannot then be denied that Faith and Repentance being both the* Duty commanded, *and the* Condition required *and* performed *are truly a* particular ſpecial Righteouſneſs, ſubordinate to Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, in order to our further participation of him, and from him.

Prop. 12. *And laſtly its paſt diſpute that this* perſonal Righteouſneſs of Faith and Repentance, *is not to be called a* Legal, *but an* Evangelical Righteouſneſs, *becauſe it is the* Goſpel *that both* commandeth *them, and* promiſeth *life to thoſe that perform them.*

Thus methinks all that I deſire is granted already: what Adverſary could a man dream of among Proteſtants in ſuch a Cauſe? Agreement ſeemeth to prevent the neceſſity of a further Diſpute.

To be yet briefer, and bring it nearer an Iſſue: If any thing of the main *Theſis* here be denyed, it muſt be one of theſe three things. 1. That there is *any ſuch thing* as Faith, Repentance or Sanctification. 2. Or that they ſhould be *called an Evangelical perſonal Righteouſneſs.* 3. Or that they are *neceſſary to Juſtification and Salvtaion*: The firſt is *de exiſtentia rei*: The ſecond is *de nomine*: The third is *de uſu & fine.*

The firſt no man but a Heathen or Infidel will deny.

And for the ſecond, that this name is fit for it, I prove by parts. 1. It may and muſt be called *A Righteouſneſs.* 2. *A Perſonal Righteouſneſs.* 3. *An Evangelical Righteouſneſs.*

1. As *Righteouſneſs* ſignifieth the *Habit* by which we give to all their own, ſo this is *Righteouſneſs.* For in Regeneration the ſoul is habituated to give up it ſelf to God as his own, and to give up all we have to him, and to love and ſerve all where his love and ſervice doth require it. No true habit is ſo excellent as that which is given in Regeneration.

2. The *ſincere* performance of the *Duties* required of us by the

the Evangelical *Precept*, is a *sincere Evangelical Righteousness*: But our first turning to God in Christ by Faith and Repentance, is the sincere performance of the duties required of us by the Evangelical Precept. *Ergo.* ——— Object. *The Gospel requireth actual external Obedience and perseverance also. Answ.* Not at the first instant of Conversion: For that instant, he that *Believeth* and *Repenteth*, doth sincerely do the Duty required by it: and afterward, he that *continueth herein* with *Expressive Obedience*, which is then part of this Righteousness.

3. The true Performance of the Conditions of Justification and Salvation, imposed in the Gospel-Promise, is a true *Gospel Righteousness*: But Faith and Repentance at the *first*, and sincere Obedience added afterward, are the true performance of these Conditions. *Ergo.* ——

4. It is commonly called by the name of *Inherent Righteousness*, by all Divines with one Consent: therefore the name of [*Righteousness*] is past controversie here.

5. That which in Judgement must be his *justitia causæ*, the Righteousness of his cause, is so far the *Righteousness of his person*: (for the person must needs be righteous *quoad hanc causam*, as to that cause) But our Faith and Repentance will be much of the Righteousness of our cause at that day (for the Tryal of us will be, whether we are true Believers, and penitent or not; and that being much of the cause of the day, we must needs be righteous or unrighteous as to that cause:) therefore our Faith and Repentance is much of the Righteousness of our persons, denominated in respect to the Tryal and Judgement of that day.

6. The holy Scripture frequently calls it *Righteousness*, and calls all true penitent Believers, and all that sincerely obey Christ, [*righteous*] because of these qualifications (supposing pardon of sin, and merit of Glory by Christ for us:) therefore we may and must so call them, *Mat.* 25. 37, 46. *Then shall the righteous answer* ——— *but the righteous into life eternal*, Mat. 10. 41. *He that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a righteous mans reward.* Heb. 11. 4. *By faith* Abel *offered,* ——— *by which he obtained witness that he was*

righteous, God testifying of his Gifts. 1 Pet. 3. 12. *For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous.* —— 1 John 3. 7. *He that doth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.* Isa. 3. 10. *Say to the righteous it shall be well with him.* Psal. 1. 5, 6. Mat. 5. 6, 20. *An enemy to the faith, is called an enemy of righteousness.* Acts 13. 10. 2 Pet. 2. 21. 1 John 2. 29. and 3. 10. Gen. 15. 6. *And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.* Psal. 106. 31. Rom. 4 3, 5. *His faith is counted for righteousness.* ver. 9. *Faith was reckoned to* Abraham *for righteousness.* ver. 22, 24. *Therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead. So* Jam. 2. 23. Gal. 3. 6. *If any say that by* [*Faith*] in all these Texts is meant *Christs righteousness*, and not *Faith*, I will believe them when I take Scripture to be intelligible only by them, and that God did not write it to have it understood. But that Faith is imputed or accounted to us for Righteousness in a sense meerly subordinate to Christs righteousness, by which we are justified, I easily grant. As to *Satisfaction* and *Merit* we have no righteousness but Christs, but a Covenant and Law we are still under, and not redeemed to be lawless; and this Covenant is ordained as the way of making over Christ and his meritorious righteousness, and life to us: and therefore they being given or made over on Covenant-terms, there is a personal performance of the conditions necessary: and so that personal performance is all the righteousness inherent or *propriæ actionis*, that God requireth of us now, whereas by the first Covenant perfect Obedience was required as necessary to life. So that in point of meer personal performance our own Faith is accepted, and imputed or accounted to us for Righteousness, that is, *God will require no more as necessary to Justification at our own hands*, but that we believe in the righteousness of another, and accept a Redeemer (though once he required more:) But as to the *satisfying* of the Justice of the offended Majesty, and the meriting of life with pardon, *&c.* So the Righteousness of Christ is our only *Righteousness*. But nothing in Scripture is more plain then that Faith it self is said to be *ac-*

counted

counted to us for Righteousness; and not only *Christs own righteousness*: He that will not take this for proof, must expect no Scripture proof of any thing from me.

Eph. 4. 24. *The new man after God is created in righteousness.* Many other Texts do call our first Conversion, or state of Grace, our faith and repentance, and our sincere obedience by the name of *Righteousness.*

2. And then that it may, and that most fitly be called an *Evangelical* righteousness, I will not trouble the Reader to prove, lest I seem to censure his understanding as too stupid. Its easie to try whether our Faith and Repentance, our Inherent Righteousness, do more answer the Precepts and Promise of Christ in the *Gospel*, or those of the *Law of works.*

3. And that this is a personal righteousness, I have less need to prove: Though it is Christ that *purchased* it (and so it may be called the *righteousness of Christ*) and the Spirit that *worketh* it in us, yet its we that are the *Subjects* and the *Agents* as to the act.

It being therefore past doubt that, 1. The *thing it self is existent and necessary.* 2. *That righteousness is a fit name for it.* 3. All that remains to be proved is the Use of it, *Whether it be necessary to Justification and Salvation.* And here the common agreement of Divines, (except the *Antinomians*) doth save us the labour of proving this: for they all agree that *Faith and Repentance* are necessary to our first Justification; and that sincere obedience also is necessary to our Justification at Judgement, and to our Salvation. So that here being no conteoversie, I will not make my self needless work.

Object. 1. *But faith and repentance are not necessary to Justification* qua justitia quædam Evangelica, *under the notion of a righteousness, but faith as an Instrument, and repentance as a qualifying condition.*

Answ. 1. We are not now upon the question under what notion these are necessary. It sufficeth to the proof of our present *Thesis*, that a personal Evangelical Righteousness is necessary, whether *quâ talis* or not.

2. But the plain truth is, 1. Remotely, in respect of its natural Aptitude to its office, faith is necessary because it is a *Receiving Act*, and therefore fitted to a *free Gift*, and an *Assenting* Act, and therefore fitted to a *supernatural Revelation*: And hence Divines say, *It justifieth as an Instrument*, calling its *Receptive nature*, Metaphorically an *Instrument* : which in this sense is true. And Repentance is necessary, because it is that Return to God, and recovery of the soul which is the end of Redemption, without which the following ends cannot be attained. The *Receptive nature* of *Faith*, and the *dispositive use* of *Repentance*, may be assigned as Reasons, *Why God made them conditions of the Promise* : as being their aptitude thereto. 2. But the *neareſt reaſon* of their *Intereſt* and *Neceſſity*, is because by the free constitution of God, they are made conditions in that Promise that conferreth Justification and Salvation, determining that without these they shall not be had, and that whoever believeth shall not perish, and if we repent, our sins shall be forgiven us. So that this is the formal or neareſt Reason of their necessity and interest, that they are the conditions of the Covenant, so made by the free Donor, Promiser, Testator. Now this which in the *first instant* and consideration is a condition, is in the *next instant* or consideration, a *true Evangelical Righteouſneſs*, as that *Condition* is a *Duty* in respect to the *Precept*; and as it is our Title to the benefit of the Promise, and so is the Covenant-performance, and as it hath respect to the sentence of Judgement, where this will be the cause of the day, *Whether this Condition was performed or not*. It is not the *Condition as impoſed*, but as *performed*, on which we become justified : And therefore as *ſentential Juſtification* is past upon the proof of this personal Righteousness, which is our performance of the condition, on which we have Title to Christ and Pardon, and eternal life; even so our Justification *in the ſenſe of the Law or Covenant*, is on supposition of this same performance of the Condition, as such; which is a certain Righteousness. If at the last Judgement we are *ſententially juſtified* by it as it is *quædam juſtitia*, a Righteousness subordinate to Christs Righteousness, (which is certain,) then in *Law-ſenſe* we are *juſtifiable* by it on the same account. For to

be

be *justified* in *point of law*, is nothing else then to be *justifiable*, or *justificandus*, by *sentence* and *execution* according to that Law: so that its clear that a *personal Righteousness*, *qua talis*, is necessary to *Justification*, and not only *qua talis*; though this be beyond our Question in hand, and therefore I add it but for *elucidation* and *ex abundanti*.

Object. 2. *If this be so, then men are righteous before God doth justifie them.*

Answ. 1. Not with that Righteousness by which he justifieth them. 2. Not Righteousness simply, absolutely or universally, but only *secundum quid*, with a particular *Righteousness*. 3. This *particular Righteousness* is but the means to possess them of Christs Righteousness, by which they are materially and fully justified. 4. There is not a moments distance of time between them: For as soon as we believe and repent we are made partakers of Christ and his Righteousness, by a meer resultancy from the Promise of the Gospel. 5. Who denyeth that we have Faith and Repentance before Justification?

Object. 3. *But according to this Doctrine we are justified before we are justified: For he that is Righteous is constituted just, and so is justifiable in Judgement, which is to be justified in Law.*

Answ. Very true: But we are as is said, made just or justified but with a *particular*, and not an *universal Righteousness*; which will not denominate the person simply a Righteous or justified person: we are so far cured of our former Infidelity and Impenitency, that we are true penitent Believers before our sins are pardoned by the Promise: and so we are in order of nature (not of time) first justifiable against the false *Accusation*, that *we are impenitent Unbelievers*, before we are justifiable against the *true accusation* of all *our sins*, *and desert of Hell*. He that by inherent Faith and Repentance is not first justifiable against the former false charge, cannot by the blood

and

and merits of Christ be justifiable against the latter true accusation. For Christ and Pardon are given by the Covenant of Grace, to none but penitent Believers.

Object. 4. *By this you confound Justification and Sanctification: for inherent Righteousness belongs not to Justification, but to Sanctification.*

Answ. Your Affirmation is no proof, and my distinguishing them is not confounding them. Inherent Righteousness in its first seed and acts belongs to Sanctification, as its *Beginning*, or first part, or root: And to Justification and Pardon as a *Means* or *Condition:* But Inherent Righteousness, in its *strength* and *progress*, belongs to *Sanctification* as the *Matter* of it, and to our final *Justification* in *Judgement* as *part* of the *means* or *condition:* but no otherwise to our *first Justification*, then as a necessary *fruit* or *consequent* of it.

Object. 5. *By this means you make Sanctification to go before Justification, as a Condition or means to it: when Divines commonly put it after.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *Pemble*, and those that follow him, put Sanctification before all true Justification, (though they call Gods immanent eternal Act, a precedent Justification.) 2. The case is easie, if you will not confound the verbal part of the controversie with the Real. What is it that you call *Sanctification?* 1. If it be the first special Grace in Act or Habit, so you will confess, that *Sanctification* goeth first: For we repent and believe before we are pardoned or justified. 2. If it be any further *degrees* or fruits, or exercise of Grace, then we are agreed that *Justification* goeth before it. 3. If it be both *beginning* and *progress*, *faith* and *obedience* that you call *Sanctification*, then part of it is *before* Justification, and part *after*. All this is plain; and that which I think we are agreed in.

But here I am invited to a consideration of some Arguments of a new Opponent, Mr. *Warner* in a book of the *Object and Office of Faith*. What he thought it his Duty to oppose, I take it to

to be my Duty to defend: which of us is guided by the light of God, I must leave to the illuminated to judge, when they have compared our Evidence.

Mr. W. *I now come to shew that both these kinds of Righteousnes, Legal and Evangelical, are not absolutely necessary to Justification.* —— —— *I do undertake the Negative, and will endeavour to prove it by these demonstrations.* Argument 1. *If things in themselves contradictory cannot be ascribed to the same person or action, then both these kinds of Righteousnes are not absolutely necessary to* make up *our Justification: But things in themselves contradictory cannot be ascribed to the same person or actions, Therefore*—*The sequell is thus proved by* Paul. *If it be of Works, it is no more of Grace: if of Grace, then it is no more of works. What are therefore these two kinds of Righteousnes, but contradictory to each other? And therefore it seemeth illogical Theologie to predicate them of the same person or act,* c. 12. *pag.* 154.

Answ. Reader, I crave thy pardon for troubling thee with the Confutation of such Impertinencies, that are called *Demonstrations*: It is I that have the bigger part of the trouble: But how should I avoid it without wrong to the Truth? Seeing (would you think it!) there are some Readers that cannot discern the vanity of such Arguings without Assistance.

1. What a gross abuse is this to begin with, to conclude that these two sorts of Righteousnes are not necessary [*to make up*] our *Justification*, when the Question was only whether they are necessary [*to*] our *Justification*. [*Making up*] expresseth the proper causality of the constitutive causes, (matter and form,) and not of the efficient or final; much less the Interest of all other means, such as a condition is. So that I grant him his conclusion, taking Justification as we now do. Our Faith or Repentance goeth not to make it up.

And yet on the by, I shall add, that if any man will needs take Justification for Sanctification, or as the Papists do *comprehensively* for Sanctification and Pardon both (as some Pro-

testant Divines think it is used in some few Texts) in that large sense our Faith and Repentance are part of our justifying Righteousness. But I do not so use the word, (Though *Philip Codurcus* have writ at large for it.)

2. I deny his Consequence: And how is it proved? By reciting *Pauls* words, *Rom.* 11 6. Which contain not any of the terms in the question. *Paul* speaks of Election: we of Justification (though that difference I regard not.) *Paul* speaks of *works*, and we speak of Evangelical Faith and Repentance. In a word therefore I answer. The works that *Paul* speaks of are inconsistent with Grace in Justification (though not contradictory, but contrary, what ever Mr. *W.* say:) but Faith and Repentance are not those works; and therefore no contrariety is hence proved. Here is nothing therefore but a rash Assertion of Mr. *W.* to prove these two sorts of Righteousness contradictory.

Be judge all Divines and Christians upon earth: Did you ever hear before from a Divine or Christian, that imputed and inherent Righteousness, or Justification and Sanctification, or Christs fulfilling the Law for us, and our believing the Gospel and repenting were contradictory in themselves? Do not all that believe the Scripture, believe that we have a personal Righteousness, a true Faith and Repentance, and must fulfill the Conditions of the Promise; and that in respect to these the Scripture calls us Righteous? (as is before proved.)

Mr. W. 2. *If the person justified is of himself ungodly, then Legal and Evangelical Righteousness are not both absolutely necessary to our Justification: But the person justified (considering him in the act of justifying) is so, therefore.* ——*The Sequel is undeniable; because he who is ungodly is not Legally Righteous; and that the person now to be justified is ungodly, is express Scripture,* Rom. 4. 5. *But to him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.*

Answ. 1. I suppose the Reader understandeth that the Legal or rather Pro-legal Righteousness, that I plead for, is Christs Merits

Merits and Satisfaction made over to us, for the effects; and that the personal Evangelical Righteousness is our believing and repenting. Now that these are both necessary, this very Text proveth, which he citeth against it. For the necessity of Christs meritorious Righteousness he will not deny that it is here implyed: and the necessity of our own faith is twice expreſt, [*To him that believeth, his faith is counted for righteousness.*] If it be the *Being* of Faith that this Brother would exclude, it is here twice expreſt: If it be only the naming it [*a righteousness*] That name also is here expreſt. How could he have brought a plainer evidence against himself?

2. To his Argument, I distinguish of [*Ungodliness*] If it be taken for an unregenerate impenitent unbeliever, then I deny the *Minor*, at least *in sensu compoſito*; A person in the instant of Justification is not an unbeliever: This Text shameth him that will affirm it. But if by [*Ungodly*] be meant [*Sinners*, or persons unjustifyable by the works of the Law, who are legally impious] then I deny the consequence of the *Major*. Do I need to tell a Divine that a man may be a sinner and a penitent Believer at once. The *Syriack* and *Ethiopick* translating the word [*sinners*] do thus expound the Text; and its the common Exposition of most judicious Divines. It is not of the Apostles meaning to tell you that God justifieth impenitent Infidels, or haters of God: but that he justifieth sinners, legally condemned and unworthy, yet true Believers, as the Text expresseth.

3. If any reject this Exposition, and will take [*ungodly*] here for [*the Impenitent*,] then the other Exposition solveth his Objection, *viz.* They were Impenitent and Unbelievers, in the instant next foregoing, but not in the instant of Justification: For faith and Justification are in the same instant of time.

4. Rather then believe that God justifieth Infidels contrary to the text, I would interpret this Text as *Beza* doth some other, as speaking of Justification as comprehending both Conversion and Forgiveness, even the conferring of Inherent and Imputed Righteousness both: and so God justifieth Infidels themselves; that is, giveth them first faith and Repentance, and then forgiveness and eternal life in Christ.

5. But I wonder at his proof of his Sequel [*Because he*

who is ungodly is not legally righteous] what is that to the Question? It is *Legal righteousnes in Christ* that Justification giveth him: Therefore we all suppose he hath it not before: But he is personally Evangelically Righteous as soon as he Believes, so far as to be a true performer of the Condition of Justification; and then in the same instant he receiveth by Justification that Righteousnes of Christ which answereth the Law.

Mr. W. *If nothing ought to be asserted by us which overthrows Apostolical writings, then the necessity of a two-fold righteousnes ought not to be asserted; But* —— Ergo. —— *The Sequel is proved by this Dilemma. Apostolical Writings are utterly against a two-fold Righteousnes in this work; therefore to assert both these kinds is to overthrow their writings, For to what purpose did* Paul *dispute against Justification by works of the Law, if the righteousnes of Faith were not sufficient? And certainly if both were required as absolutely necessary, it would argue extream ignorance in* Paul *if he should not have known it, and as great unfaithfulnes if*, &c. ——

Answ. Either this Writer owns the two-fold Righteousnes that he disputeth against, or not: If he did not, he were an Infidel or wretched Heretick, directly denying Christ or Faith; For Christ is the one Righteousnes, and faith the other. If he do own them (as I doubt not at all but he doth) is it not good service to the Church to pour out this opposition against words not understood, and to make men believe that the difference is so material as to overthrow the Scriptures? But to his Argument, I deny the consequence of the *Major*; and how is it proved? forsooth *by a Dilemma*, (which other folks call an Enthymeme) Of which the Antecedent (*That Apostolical writings are against a two-fold righteousnes*) is proved by this Writers word. A learned proof! into which his Disputations are ultimately resolved. It is the very work of *Pauls* Epistles to prove the necessity of this Two-fold Righteousnes (unless you will with the Papists call it rather two parts of one Righteousnes,) Christs merits and mans faith, one in our surety, the other wrought by him in our selves.

But,

But, saith he, to what purpose did *Paul* dispute against Justification by the works of the Law, If the Righteousness of faith were not sufficient? ——I answer you, 1. Because no man hath a personal legal Righteousness: But *Paul* never disputed against a legal Righteousness in Christ, or his fulfilling the Law, or being made a curse for us. Do you think he did? 2. A Righteousness of faith is sufficient: for it signifieth this two-fold righteousness. 1. That righteousness which faith accepteth, which is [*of Faith*] because proclaimed in the Gospel, and is the *object* of Faith; and yet it is legal, in that it was a Conformity to the Law, and satisfaction to the Law-giver. 2. *Faith it self*, which is a particular subservient Evangelical Rigeteousness, for the application and possession of the former.

And now was here a fit occasion to speak so reproachfully of *Paul*, as extream ignorant, or unfaithfull, or *immanis sophista*? and all because he would not deny either Christ or Faith? Sure *Paul* hath let us see by revealing both, that he was neither ignorant, unfaithfull nor a Sophister.

Mr. W. 4. *If both Legal and Evangelical righteousness were thus required to the purpose of justifying, then it must be because the Evangelical is of it self insufficient. But ——For if Christs righteousness be insufficient to Salvation, he were not a sufficient Saviour, and if the Righteousness of Faith in him were of it self insufficient.*

Answ. By this time I am tempted to repent that I medled with this Brother. If he live to read over a reply or two, he may possibly understand them that he writes against. He will prove that a *Legal* Righteousness is not necessary, because Christs righteousness (which is it that I called legal) is sufficient. Its sufficient alone: therefore not *Necessary*. Am not I like to have a fair hand think you of this Disputer? To his Argument once more I distinguish: Evangelical righteousness is twofold. 1. That which the Gospel revealeth and offereth: and this is Christs righteousness, therefore called Evangelical: but also Legal, because it answered the rule of the Law of works, and its ends. 2. That which the Gospel hath made the

Condition of our part in Christ and his righteousnes: and this is Faith it self. Both these are sufficient to Justification: but Faith is neither *sufficient*, nor is *Faith* without Christs legal righteousnes: And Christ is sufficient *Hypothetically*, but will not be *effectual* to our Justification without Faith (and repentance.)

But perhaps this Writer means only to shew his offence against my naming Christs righteousnes legal. If that be so, 1. I have given in my reasons, because there can be no better reason of a name then from the form: and the form of Christs righteousnes being relative, even a conformity to the Law of works (and to the peculiar Covenant of redemption,) I thought did sufficiently warrant this name. 2. The rather when I find not only that he is said to fulfill the Law and all righteousnes, and be made a curse for us, but also to be righteous with that righteousnes, which is denyed of us, which can be none but a legal or prolegal righteousnes. 3. But yet if the name [*Legal*] be all, I could easily have given this Brother leave to differ from me about a name without contention, and methinks he might have done the like by me.

Mr. W. Obje&. *But what if works and faith were both of them applyed to procure our Justification?*

Answ. This Objection yet further shews, that the Author understands me not (if it be me, as I have reason to judge that he writeth against) for he supposeth that its works that I call a legal Righteousnes, when I still tell him it is Christs satisfaction and fulfilling the Law, of which our faith or works are no part, but a subordinate, particular, Evangelical Righteousnes.

Mr. W. 5. *If both these kinds of Righteousnes were absolutely necessary, then where one of them is wanting in a person, there can be no Justification of that person. But* ——— Ergo. ——— *For where was any Legal Righteousnes of the good thief on the Cross, condemned for legal unrighteousnes?*

Answ.

Anſw. I deny your minor. The converted thief had a legal righteouſneſs hanging on the next Croſs to him; even Chriſt that then was made a curſe for him, and was obedient to the death of the Croſs. I begin to be a weary in writing ſo much only to tell men that you underſtand me not.

Mr. W. 6. *If legal Righteouſneſs be thus neceſſarily to be joined with our Evangelical Righteouſneſs to Juſtification, then there muſt be two formal cauſes of Juſtification.*

Anſw. I deny your conſequence. If the formal cauſe conſiſt in remiſſion and imputation as you ſay, then Chriſts meritorious righteouſneſs is none of the *Form*, but the *Matter*. And if beſides that *Matter* a ſubſervient particular righteouſneſs (of faith) be neceſſary as the condition of our *Title* to Chriſt; this makes not two forms of this Juſtification. 2. And yet I grant you that it infers a ſubſervient Juſtification that hath another form, when you are made a Believer, or juſtified againſt the falſe charge of being no Believer (or penitent) this is not remiſſion of ſin, but another form and thing.

Mr. W. 7. *That which maketh void Chriſts death, cannot be abſolutely neceſſary to Juſtification. But legal righteouſneſs makes void his Death*, Gal. 2. 21.

Anſw. Its a ſad caſe that we muſt be charged with making void Chriſts Death, for ſaying that he is legally Righteous, by ſatisfying and fulfilling the Law; and that this is all the legal righteouſneſs that we have. I am bold therefore to deny the *Minor*: yea and to reverſe it on you, and tell you, that he that denyeth Chriſts legal Righteouſneſs, denyeth both his death and obedience. The Text *Gal.* 2. 21. ſpeaks not of the Law, as fulfilled by Chriſt, but by us. Righteouſneſs comes not by our keeping the Law, but it came by Chriſts keeping it: yet ſo, that the Goſpel only giveth us that righteouſneſs of his.

Mr. W. 8. *That which concurs with another efficient, muſt have*

have both an aptitude and Confluence to produce the effect: but the Law, and consequently Legal righteousness hath no aptitude to give life, Gal.3.2.

Answ. This is Disputing enough to make one tremble, and loath Disputing. Is there no aptitude in Christs legal Righteousness to give us life? The Law doth not *give us* righteousness, but it *denominateth Christ righteous* for fulfilling it (and the Law-giver for satisfying) and to that it had a sufficient aptitude. The Text *Gal.*3.2. saith truly that the Law giveth not life: but first it speaks of the Law as obeyed by us, and not by Christ, that fulfilled it. Secondly, And indeed its speaks of *Moses* Law; and not directly of that made with *Adam*. Thirdly, And it denies not that Christ fulfilling it may give us life, though the Law it selfgive us none, so that all this is besides the business.

Mr. W. 9. *That Doctrine which doth most exalt the Grace of God, ought to be admitted before that which doth least exalt it: But the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, as our Gospel-righteousness doth most exalt his Grace, and the other less.* Ergo.

Answ. Still misunderstanding! Doth the Doctrine of faith alone without Christ advance Grace? Thats no faith. You do not think so: that which denyeth Christ or faith denyeth Grace.

Mr. W. 10. *That opinion which considereth a person under a two-fold Covenant at the same time, ought not to be admitted: But to require both Legal and Evangelical Righteousness, is to consider him under the Covenant of works and Grace: I conclude therefore that two sorts of righteousness are not necessarily required to our Justification.*

Answ. How far we are, or are not under the Covenant of works, I will not here trouble you by digressing, in this rambling Dispute to enquire. But to your *Minor* I say, this opinion considereth man only under the curse of the Law till Christ take it off him, by being made a curse for us, and making over the fruit of his merits and suffering to us.

Mr. W.2.

Mr. W. 2. *As for the Subjects of these kinds of Righteousness, I thus declare.* 1. *That Jesus Christ and he alone who was truly endued with Legal righteousness, who as he was made under the Law, so he did not destroy but fulfill it; and if he had not been the subject of Legal righteousness in himself, he could not have been the Author of Evangelical Righteousness to us.*

Answ. Here after all these Arguments, I have all that granted me that I contend for (supposing the Imputation or Donation of Christs Righteousness to us, whether *in se* or *in effectis*, I now dispute not.) You have here his full confession that Christ had a legal Righteousness: Let him but grant the imputation of this, and then its ours: And then I have granted him that it may be also called Evangelical in another respect.

Mr. W. *pag.*166. *I think it to be no incongruity in speech, or Paradox in Divinity, to say that Christs Legal righteousness is our Evangelical righteousness,* 1 Cor. 1.30. 2 Cor. 5.21. Jer. 23.8.

Answ. Sure we shall agree anon, for all the ten Arguments. Heres all granted but the name as to us. Many and many a time I have said, that Christs Righteousness made ours is Legal in respect to the Law that it was a conformity to, and which it answereth for us; but Evangelical as declared, and given by the Gospel. But the thing in question you now fully confess.

Mr. W. *pag.*171. *That We our selves are not the subjects of Evangelical righteousness, I shall endeavour to prove by these Arguments.* 1. *If our Evangelical righteousness be out of us in Christ, then it is not in us, consisting in the habit or Acts of faith and Gospel obedience, but it is out of us in Christ.*

Answ. We shall have such another piece of work with this point as the former, to defend the truth against a man that layeth about him in the dark. 1. I have oft enough distinguisht of Evangelical righteousness. The righteousness *conform* to the *Law*, and *revealed* and *given* by the *Gospel* is meritoriously and materially out of us in Christ. The righteousness *conform* to the

Gospel, as constituting the *condition* of life, [*He that believeth shall not perish : Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out*,] This is in our selves materially, and not out of us in Christ.

Mr. W. 2. *If satisfaction to Divine Justice were not given or caused by any thing in us, but by Christ alone, then Evangelical righteousness is in Christ alone. But* — Ergo — *without blood no remission.*

Answ. Your proof of the consequence is none; but worse then silence. Besides the satisfaction of Justice and remission of sin thereby; there is a subservient Gospel righteousness, as is proved, and is undeniable.

Mr. W. 3. *If Evangelical righteousness be in our selves, then perfect righteousness is in our selves. But thats not so.* Ergo.

Answ. Still you play with the ambiguity of a word, and deny that which beseems you not to deny, that the fulfilling of the condition [*Believe and Live*] is a Gospel-righteousness, particular and subservient and imperfect. The Saints have an *Inherent righteousness*, which is *not Legal*: therefore it is *Evangelical*. If you say, *its no righteousness*, you renounce the constant voice of Scripture. If you say, it is a *Legal* righteousness imperfect, then you set up Justification by the works of the Law, (the unhappy fate of blind opposition, to do what they intend to undo.) For there is no *righteousness* which doth not *justifie* or *make righteous in tantum* : and so you would make men justified partly by Christ, and partly by a Legal righteousness of their own, by a perverse denying the subservient Evangelical righteousness, without any cause in the world, but darkness, jealousie, and humorous contentious zeal. Yea more then so, we have no works but what the Law would damn us for, were we judged by it. And yet will you say that faith or inherent righteousness is Legal and not Evangelical?

Mr. W. 4. *If Evangelical righteousness were in ourselves, and did*

did consist either in the habit or act of faith and new obedience, then upon the intercision of those acts, our Justification would discontinue. But,

Answ. If you thought not your word must go for proof, you would never sure expect that we should believe your Consequence. For 1. What shew is there of reason that the intercision of the act should cause the cessation of that Justification which is the consequent of the Habit (which you put in your Antecedent?) The Habit continueth in our sleep, when the acts do not.

2. As long as the cause continueth (which is Christs Merits and the Gospel-Grant) Justification will continue, if the condition be but sincerely performed (For the Condition is not the cause, much less a Physical cause) But the condition is sincerely performed, though we believe not in our sleep. I dare not instance in your payment of Rent, left a Carper be upon my back; but suppose you give a man a lease of Lands on condition he come once a moneth, or week, or day, and say, *I thank you*, or in general, on condition he *be thankful*. Doth his Title cease as oft as he shuts his lips from saying, *I thank you*? These are strange Doctrines.

Mr. W. 5. If Evangelical righteousness were in our selves, and faith with our Gospel-obedience were that righteousness, then he who hath more or less faith or obedience, were more or less justified, and more or less Evangelically righteous, according to the degrees of faith and obedience.

Answ. I deny your Consequence, considering faith and repentance as the Condition of the Promise; because it is the *sincerity* of Faith and Repentance that is the Condition, and not the *degree*: and therefore he that hath the least degree of sincere faith, hath the same title to Christ as he that hath the strongest.

2. But as faith and obedience respect the *Precept* of the Gospel, and not the *Promise*; so it is a certain truth, that he that hath most of them, hath most Inherent Righteousness.

Mr. W. 6. *That opinion which derogates from the Glory and Excellency of Christ above all Graces, and from the excellency of Faith in its Office of justifying above other Graces, ought not to be admitted: But this opinion placing our Evangelical Righteousness in the habit, act, or Grace of faith and Gospel obedience derogates from both Christ and Faith.*

Answ. Your *Minor* is false, and your proof is no proof, but your word. Your similitude should have run thus. If an Act of Oblivion by the Princes purchase, do pardon all that will thankfully accept it and come in and lay down arms of Rebellion; it is no derogating from the Prince or pardon to say, I accept it, I stand out no longer, and therefore it is mine. If you offer to heal a deadly sore on condition you be accepted for the Chyrurgion; doth it derogate from your honour if your Patient say, I do consent and take you for my Chyrurgion, and will take your Medicines?

Your proof is as vain and null, that it derogates from faith. What, that Faith should be this subservient Righteousness? Doth that dishonour it? Or is it that Repentance is conjoyned as to our first Justification, and obedience as to that at Judgement? When you prove either of these dishonourable to faith, we will believe you; but it must be a proof that is stronger then the Gospel that is against you. We confess faith to be the *receiving Condition*, and repentance but the *disposing Condition*: but both are *Conditions*. As for *Phil.* 3. 9. Do you not see that it is against you? I profess with *Paul*, not to have *a righteousness of my own which is of the Law*, (which made me loth to call faith and repentance a legal righteousness) but *that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*: Faith you see is the means of our Title to Christs Righteousness: And if you deny faith it self to be any particular Righteousness, you must make it a sin, or indifferent, and contradict the Scriptures. And presently contradicting what you have been arguing for (that Evangelical Righteousness is not in us, and we are not the Subjects of it:) You profess *pag.* 178. That Inherent *Righteousness* is in us.

It

It seems then either Inherent *righteousness* is not *righteousness*, or it is not *Evangelical* but *Legal*, or it is in us, and not in us.

Had you only pleaded that we are not justified by it as a Righteousness, I should have answered you as before on that point. Not as a Legal Righteousness; nor an Evangelical Righteousness co-ordinate with Christs; but as a fulfilling of the Condition of that Promise, which gives us Christ, and Pardon, and Life; by which performance of the Condition, the Benefit becomes ours by the Will and Grant of the free Donor; and we are no longer impenitent Infidels, but just, and justifiable from the false charge of being such; and so of not having part in Christ. Its one thing to be accused of sin as sin: And another thing to be accused of the special sin of not accepting the Remedy: and so of having no part in Christ and his Righteousness. From the later we must have a real Faith and Title to Christ, which must materially justifie us: but from the former, even from all sin that ever we are guilty of. Christs Righteousness only justifieth us materially and meritoriously, and our faith is but a bare condition.

A Confutation of the Error of Mr. Warners 13th *Chapter about Justification, and the interest of Obedience therein.*

HE begins with a false Intimation, that we revive the Papists first and second Justification: and he that will believe him, may take his course for me: I crave only liberty for my self to believe that it is not all one to have Justification begun and continued; and that Justification by the sentence of the Judge, is not of the same kind with Justification Legal by the Donation of the Gospel. If I may not have this Reverend Brothers leave to believe these matters, I will believe them without his leave. And that the Papists have such friends among us, as those that make the world believe that such things as these are Popery, I will also lament, though such Disputers give not their consent.

His Endeavours to overthrow that Doctrine of mine which he nameth of [*second Justification*] begin *pag.* 223. where he argueth, 1. from *Rom.* 5. 1 2,3. *That the beginning and end is ascribed to faith.* Answer. Its all granted: faith is it that we are justified by to the last. We are agreed of this inclusively: But the Question is, whats the Exclusion: Not *believing in Christ as Lord and Master, nor loving him*; but the works that make or are supposed to make that Reward to be of debt, and not of Grace.

His second proof is from *Phil.* 3.7,8. To which I answer. We are of *Pauls* mind, but not of yours. 1. He counted all

as

as loss and dung that stood in opposition to, or competition with Christ: and so would I do by faith and love it self, (should they be so arrogant. 2. *Paul* expressly nameth the works that he excludeth, that is, the *Righteousness which is of the Law*, or in *Legal Works*. And do we make any doubt of this? No, nor of those works that materially are Evangelical: for if they are formally Evangelical, they cannot be set up against Christ, their very nature being to subserve him.

Once for all, remember this Argument. Those works that are commanded by God in the Gospel, are not excluded by God in the Gospel in that nature and to the use for which they are commanded. But faith in Christ Jesus the Lord and Saviour, (an entire faith) and Repentance towards God and love to him are commanded by God in the Gospel in order to the pardon of sin; and the continuance of these with sincere Obedience, are commanded as *means* of our continued pardon, and as a means of our final Justification at Judgement. Therefore none of these are excluded by the Gospel from any of these uses or ends.

He citeth also, *Act.* 15. and *Heb.* 2.9. and *Rom.* 1.17. to as much purpose as the rest.

Pag. 228. He begins his Arguments. The first is [*Because in vain are additions of numbers, without which any thing may be done: But Without addition of Works the act of justifying is perfect, Ergo.*] Answer. 1. As if the Question were of the [*Act of justifying,*] and not of Justification passively taken. Gods act hath no imperfection, when yet it maketh not a perfect work. 2. Its but spleen and partiality to harp upon the term [*works*] still to seduce your Readers to believe that I am for such works as *Paul* denyeth. I use not the phrase of [*Justification by works*] nor think it fit to be used, unless rarely, or to explain such texts of Scripture as do use it, or terms equipollent. 3. Justification is neither perfect nor real, without a faith in Christ as Head and Husband, and Lord, and Teacher, and Intercessor, as well as a Sacrifice for sin. Nor is it perfect or true, without repenting and loving Christ. 4. Justification is so far perfect at first, as that no sin past or existent is unpardoned. But it is not so perfect, but that, 1. Many future sins must have re-

newed

newed pardon. 2. And means is to be used by us, (believing again at least) for that end. 3. And the continuance of pardon is given us but conditionally, (though we shall certainly perform the condition.) 4. And the most perfect sort of Justification (by sentence at Judgement) is still behind. Are these things doubtfull among Divines or Christians? That the Church must be thus molested by such disputing volumes against it, to make the Papists and other enemies believe we hold I know not what? Read the many Arguments of learned *Sandford* and *Parker de Descensu*, and Bp. *Usher de Descensu* (to the *Jesuite*) by which they prove that all separated souls, as separated, are under penalty, and that Christs soul as seperated was so: and then tell us whether your fancy of absolutely perfect Justification at the first will hold or not. I wonder that men should so little know the difference betwixt Earth and Heaven; a sinner in flesh, and a Saint that is equal to the Angels of God? and should dream of such perfection short of heaven, the place of our perfection?

His second Argument is, [*Faith and works are here contrary: If of Faith, then not of works*] Answer. Its true of the works that *Paul* excludes: but not of the works that you exclude: For Faith *in Christ* is [*Works*] with such as you, save only that act that resteth on his satisfaction for righteousness: And repentance and love to Christ, and denying our own righteousness, are *works* with you. And all these are necessarily subservient to Christ and Grace, and therefore not contrary. *Augustine*, and after him the School-men, put it into their most common definition of Grace, that its a thing [*qua nemo male utitur.*] And as to efficiency its certainly true: Grace doth not do any harm: And if I may presume to tell *Augustine* that [*objectively*] Grace may be ill used, yet perhaps he might reply, [not *qua talis, without contradiction*] In good sadness, Is it not a strange thing for a man in his wits, to expect to be justified in co-ordination with Christs merits, by denying that he hath any merits of his own that can so justifie him, and by repenting of those sins that have condemned him, and by desiring, loving, hoping in Christ alone for his Justification: or by Thankfulness to God for justifying him by the sole merits of Christ? And is it not a strange Exposition

sition that feigneth *Paul* to mean and exclude such acts as these under the name of works. But yet really if such a man be to be found, that doth think to merit Justification by denying such merit, I am against him as well as you.

His third Argument is, [*If faith justifie only as the beginning of our Justification, then here are degrees of Justification: but there are no degrees.* Ergo.] *Answer.* 1. Faith is neither the Beginning nor End of Justification, but a means of it. 2. If you would insinuate that I deny faith to be the means of our continued, as well as begun Justification, you deal deceitfully. 3. I deny your Consequence. It may prove more necessary to the *Continuance* of our Justification, then to its beginning, and yet prove no degrees. 4. But how Justification hath or hath not Degrees, I have told you before, and fuller in other writings.

His fourth Argument is, [*Because good works do not precede, but follow Justification.*] Answer. 1. Repentance, and the Love of God in Christ, and faith in Christ as Lord, and Head, and Teacher, do go before the pardon of sin, and so before Justification. 2. External obedience goeth before Justification at Judgement, and Justification as continued here. Did you doubt of these?

His fifth Argument is, that [*These two Justifications overthrow each other: If by one we have peace with God, what need the other? How can good works perfect our Justification, being themselves imperfect?*] Answer. All this is answered in the second Disputation. 1. Its no contradiction to be justified by God, by Christ, by Faith, by Words, by Works, if God be to be believed, that affirmeth all. 2. As imperfect faith may be the condition of pardon, so may imperfect Repentance, and imperfect Obedience of our sentential Absolution.

Pag. 238. He answereth the Objection. [*Blessedness is ascribed to other Graces.*] thus: *Not as if Happiness were in them per se, but only as they are signs.*] Answer. *Proving* is more then *Ascribing*: Its a great advantage for you to have the forming of your Objections. 2. Happiness *per se* is as much in Love, as in Faith, and more. 3. Other Graces

are *media*, means, which is more then only works.

Pag. 241. He proves that works justifie not subordinate to Faith] thus [Argument 1. *No good works were found till faith had done its works*] Answer. 1. Faith hath not done its work till death; we are not justified only by the first act of faith: but by after-acts to the Death. 2. Faith in Christ as Head, and Lord, and Teacher, and Desire and Repentance were found before Faith had justified us. 3. Obedience is found before the sentential Justification, or the continuation of our first received Righteousness.

His second Argument is, [*Because good works are the effects of Faith and Justification, and therefore cannot be the cause.*] Answer 1. They are none of the cause at all. Its not well to intimate that we hold them the cause, as in despight of all our own denyals. 2. They are not so much as Means or Antecedents of that part of Justification, of which they are the effect. The act of faith which you will exercise before your death, is as true a condition (or Instrument, if you will needs call it so) of your Justification as continued, as your first act of faith was of your Justification as begun. And yet that act of faith is but the fruit of your first Justification, as well as Obedience is.

His third Argument is, that [*If Gospel Obedience, and good works do subordinately act with faith to the effecting of Justification, then the Justification which proceedeth from both, must be of a different kind and nature.*] Answer 1. Neither faith nor works effect Justification. 2. Justification by Promise and Gift, and Justification by Sentence, Plea, *&c.* are much different. 3. But your consequence is nothing worth. For these are not causes, but conditions. And if they were, yet different causes may concur to the same effect, which never man before you denyed, that I know of. Our case is, as if to a Rebell that hath forfeited Life and Estate, the King (upon a Ransom) grant him both, on condition that he thankfully accept them as the fruits of that gift and Ransom, and to hold them on condition, that he often do his Homage to the King, and return not to Rebellion. Doth the first acceptance here serve turn for continuance of what is first received,

ceived, without the following Homage and Fidelity? or do the different parts of the condition make such a difference in the benefit, as you here take the [*Monstrous Justification*] to be (as you rashly call it?)

Another Argument is, [*If faith be a total cause or condition of producing the effect of Justification, then there's no want of obedience for its assistance.*] Answer 1. Faith or obedience are no causes of pardon. 2. I will not trouble the Reader to open the shame of that Philosophy which you make such ostentation of. Only I would remember you, that causes total *in suo genere*, may have others under them. And that it followeth not, that the sun shineth not, or the fire heateth not, or that you understand not, and wrote not these words, though I suppose you will say that God is *Causa totalis* of all these acts: nor yet that God doth use his creatures because of an insufficiency in himself. 3. Faith taken for our [*becoming Believers, Disciples, Christians*] is the total condition of our first Receiving Justification. 2. Faith taken more narrowly for our accepting Christs Righteousness, is not the total Condition of our first Receiving of Justification. 3. Obedience is part of the condition of the continuance of it, and of our sentential Justification. And whereas you talk over and over of [*Total causes, and particular causes.*] I tell you again they are no causes.

He adds that then [*Obedience doth* nihil agere, *or* actum agere.] Answer. It doth *nihil efficere.* But besides, [*nihil*] and [*factum*] there's two things oft mentioned, Justification at Judgement, and the non-amission of it here.

3. He insipidly again disputes that [*If an effect doth totally proceed from any cause, then it totally depends on it.*] And what then? Therefore it solely dependeth on it: And if these things were true, what are they to our question? But saith he, [*When good works, the fruit of faith are interrupted, yet our Justification abides by the single influence of faith only as a total cause of its being and conservation.*] Answer. 1. Alas! What would such Disputants do with the Church, if Gods mercy did not hinder them! By your own Argument now, neither God, nor Christ, nor the Gospel are any causes of our Justifi-

cation. For you say Faith is a *Total cause*, and there can be but one *Total Cause*, unless you lose the honor of your Philosophy. 2. Faith is no proper cause at all. 3. Did you not see what must needs be answered you. That Faith is interrupted as well as Obedience and yet no intercision of our Justification. When we sleep we do not (at least alway) act faith no more then obedience (if so much.) And the habit of both continueth together sleeping and waking: And if you should give over love and sincerity of obedience, you would cease to be justified.

His last Argument is, [*Because for sins after Conversion, We must have recourse only by faith to Christ, as our Advocate.*] Answer. 1. That speaks only of renewed pardon for particular sins, but not of our Justification at Judgement, nor the non-omission here. 2. We must have recourse to Christ with Repentance, and esteem, and self-denial, and desire, *&c.* as well as that act of faith which you plead for, as the *total cause*. And when you would set *Zanchy* against *Zanchy*, you do but mis-understand him. He saith truly with *Paul*, that neither in whole or part are our own works (such as *Paul* speaks of) our Righteousness, that is, to answer the Law as *Paul* mentioneth, or any way to merit or satisfie, or stand in co-ordination with Christ. But *Zanchy* never thought that Repentance and Faith in Christ as Head, and Lord, and Desire, and Gratitude, *&c.* might be no means or Conditions of any sort of Justification, or of that which we assert them to be means of.

I would answer much more of this Disputation; but I am perswaded the judicious Reader will think I have done him wrong, in troubling him with this much. See *pag.* 298, 299. how he answereth the Objection, that pardon is promised to Repentance, *&c.* I will not disparage the Readers understanding so much as to offer him a Confutation of that, and much more of the Book. Only his many Arguments on the Question of my first Disputation, I must crave your Patience, while I examine briefly, and I will tire you with no more.

Mr.

Mr. W. *pag.* 411, 412. *I will rally up my Arguments against the foresaid Definition of Faith to be an accepting of Christ as Lord and Saviour: proving that Christ only as Saviour and Priest, offering himself up to the death of the Cross for our sins, is the proper Object of justifying Faith, as justifying.* Argument 1. *If the Faith of the Fathers under the old Testament was directed to Christ as dying Priest and Saviour; then also the Faith of Believers now ought so to be directed. But.—Ergo.*——

Answ. 1. I grant the whole, and never made question of it. But what kin is the conclusion of this Argument to that which you had to prove, unless [*Only*] had been added. Did we ever deny that Faith must be directed to Christ as Priest? 2. A Saviour is a term respecting our whole Salvation, and so Christ saveth by Teaching, Ruling, and judicial justifying as well as dying. 3. The Fathers faith did not respect Christ as dying or satisfying only, which you should prove, but cannot.

Mr. W. *Argument* 2. *If Christ as dying, and as Saviour do satisfie Gods Justice, and pacifie a sinners conscience, then as dying and Saviour he is the Object of justifying Faith. But*——*Ergo.*——

Answ. The same answer serveth to this as to the last. The conclusion is granted, but nothing to the Question, unless [*Only*] had been in. 2. Christ as obeying actively, and Christ as Rising, and as interceding, and as judging, as King, doth also justifie us, *Rom.* 5.19. *Rom.* 4 24, 25. *Rom* 8.33, 34. *Mat.* 12.37. and 25. 34, 40. Peruse these Texts impartially, and be ignorant of this if you can. 3. And yet the Argument will not hold, that no act of faith is the condition of Justification, but those whose object is considered only as justifying. The accepting of Christ to sanctifie us, is a real part of the condition of Justification.

Mr. W. Argument 3. *If Christ as Lord be properly the Object of fear, then he is not properly the Object of Faith as justifying*: But—*Ergo.*——

Answ. 1. If [*Properly*] be spoken *de proprio quarto modo*, then is Christ properly the Object of neither, that is, he is not the object of either of these *Only*. 2. But if [*properly*] be opposed to a tropical, analogical, or any such improper speech, then he is the Object as Lord, both of fear, and faith, and obedience, *&c.* 3. The deceit that still misleads most men in this point, is in the terms of reduplication, [*faith as justifying,*] which men that look not through the bark, do swallow without sufficient chewing, and so wrong themselves and others by meer words. Once more therefore understand, that when men distinguish between *fides quæ justificans*, and *qua justificans*, and say, [*Faith which justifieth, accepteth Christ as Head and Lord; but faith as justifying, taketh him only as a Priest.*] The very distinction in the later branch of it, [*qua justificans.*] Is 1. Either palpable false Doctrine. 2. And a meer begging of the Question. 3. Or else co-incident with the other branch, and so contradictory to their assertion. For 1. The common Intent and meaning is, that [*Fides quæ credit in Christum justificat*: And so they suppose that Faith is to be denominated formally [*justificans*] *ab objecto qua objectum*: And if this be true, then *fides qua fides justificat*: For the object is essential to faith *in specie.* And so in their sense, [*fides quæ justificans*] is but the implication of this false Doctrine, that *hæc fides in Christum crucifixum qua talis justificat.* Which I never yet met with sober Divine that would own when he saw it opened. For the nature and essence of faith, is but its aptitude to the office of justifying, and it is the Covenant or free Gift of God *in modo promittendi*, that assigneth it its office. The nature of faith is but the *Dispositio materiæ*; but its neareſt *interest* in the effect is as a condition of the Promise performed. 2. But if by the [*quâ justificans*] any should intend no more then to define the nature materially of that faith which is the condition of Justification, then

the

the *qua* and the *quæ* is all one: and then they contradict their own Assertion, that [*fides quâ justificans non recipit Christum ut Dominum.*] 3. If the [*quâ*] should relate to the effect, then it would only express a distinction between *Justification* and other *Benefits*, and not between faith and faith. For then [*quâ justificans*] should be contradistinct only from [*qua sanctificans*] or the like. And if so, it is one and the same Faith and the same acts of faith, that sanctifie and justifie. As if a King put into a gracious act, to a company of Rebels, that they shall be pardoned, honoured, enriched, and all upon condition of their thankfull acceptance of him, and of this act of Grace: Here there is no room to distinguish of their Acceptance, as if the acceptance of pardon were the condition of pardon, and the acceptance of riches were the condition of their Riches, *&c.* But it is the same acceptance of their Prince and his Act of Grace, that hath relation to the several consequent benefits, & may be called pardoning, honouring & enriching in several respects. It is the same marriage of a Prince that makes a woman rich, honourable, *&c.* So it is the same faith in whole Christ, as Christ, that is sanctifying and justifying, as it relateth to the several Benefits: that is, it is the condition of both, so that their [*quâ justificans*] doth either intimate this untruth, that *hæc fides quæ talis, id est, qua fides in Christum crucifixum justificat*] (which is true, neither of one act, nor other,) and so begs the Question, or else it saith nothing. So that I shall never admit this *qua justificans*, without an Exposition; and better then yet I have seen from any that use it.

Mr. W. Argument 4. That which is the sum and substance of Evangelical preaching, is the object of Justifying Faith. But Christ as crucified, is the substance of Evangelical preaching. Ergo.

Answ. 1. When I come to look for the conclusion which excluded Christ as Lord, Teacher, *&c.* from being the object, I can find no such thing in any Argument that yet I see. They have the same fate as Mr. *Blakes* Arguments had, to con-

clude

clude no more then what I grant, that is, that Christ as crucified, is the object of justifying faith. But wheres the [*Only*,] or any exclusive of the rest. 2. But if it be implyed, then 1. I say of the term crucified, that Christ crucified to purchase sanctification and salvation, is the object of that faith which is the condition of Justification, and not only Christ crucified to procure Justification. 2. I deny the Minor, if by [sum and substance] you exclude Christ as Lord, Teacher, Judge, Head, *&c.* Surely Evangelical preaching containeth Christs Resurrection, Lord-ship, Intercession, *&c.* as well as his death, or else the Apostles preached not the Gospel. This needs no proof with them that have read the Bible.

Mr. W. Argum. 5. That which we should desire to know above all things, is the Object of justifying faith: But that is Christ crucified. —— Ergo.

Answ. 1. Still the Question wanting in the conclusion: Who denyeth that Christ crucified is the object of justifying faith? 2. But if [*only*] be here understood, really doth not this Brother desire to know Christ obeying, Christ risen, Christ teaching, ruling, interceding, *&c*? I do.

Mr. W. Argument 6. That in Christ is the object of faith, as justifying which being apprehended doth justifie us: But the death, suffering, blood, obedience of Christ to death is that. —— Therefore it is the proper object of faith, as justifying.

Answ. 1. I distinguish of the term [*as justifying*] and answer as before. No act of Faith effecteth our Justification: and whole faith is the condition: The being or Nature of no act is the formal or neareſt reason of faiths Interest in Justification It justifieth not [*as this act, nor as that.*] 2. If [*only*] or some exclusive be not implyed in the conclusion, I grant it still: But if it be, then both Major and Minor are falſe. 1. The Major is falſe, for it is not only the matter of our Justification, that is the object of justifying faith. To affirm this, is but to beg the question: we expect your proof. 2. The

Minor

Minor is false: for besides the sufferings mentioned, the very person of Christ, and the active obedience of Christ, and the Title to pardon given us in the Gospel, *&c.* apprehended by faith do justifie. But the question is not what justifieth *ex parte Christi*, but *ex parte nostri*.

Mr. W. Argument 7. *That which the Gospel doth first present us with, is the Object of faith as justifying: But Christ is in the Gospel first presented as a Saviour: therefore he is therein the object of faith as justifying.*

Answ. 1. Distinguishing as before of the [*as justifying*] I still grant the whole; the exclusive and so the question is still wanting in the conclusion. 2. But if he mean *only*, then both *Maior* and *Minor* are false. The *Maior* is false; for that which the Gospel doth first present us with, is but *part* of the object of justifying Faith. For it presenteth us with the Articles to which we must Assent, and to the Good which we must Accept by degrees, and not all in a sentence or word. The *Minor* is false, because in order of nature, the Description of Christs Person goeth first, and of his Office afterward. 3. The word *Saviour*, comprehendeth both his Prophetical and Kingly Office, by which he saveth us from sin and Hell; as also his Resurrection, Ascention, Intercession, *&c.* And in this large sense I easily grant the Conclusion. 4. If by *a Saviour*, he mean only (as his cause importeth) a sacrifice for sin, then (as this is a strangely limited sense of the word *Saviour*, so) certainly the Incarnation, Baptism, Temptation, Miracles, Obedience of Christ are all expresst before this; And if it were otherwise, yet the consequence of the *Maior* is utterly groundless and vain. Priority or Posteriority of any point delivered in the Gospel, is a poor Argument to prove it the Object (much less it alone) of justifying faith.

Mr. W. Argument 8. *That which the Lords Supper doth as a seal present to justifying faith, that is the object of faith as justifying: But the Lords Supper doth present us with Christ as dying.*——Ergo.

Answ. 1. Still the question is wanting in the conclusion. What a pack of Arguments are here? 2. Do you believe in your conscience, that Christ is presented and represented in the Supper only as dying?

Mr. W. Argument 9. *If We have Redemption and remission of sins through faith in his blood, then faith as justifying should only look upon that: But We have redemption and remission of sins by his blood*, Col. 1.

Answ. Here's one Argument that hath the question in the conclusion. But 1. I deny the consequence of the *Major*, as not by Christians to be endured. The [*only*] followeth not. Though we must be justified by his blood, I have proved before, that we are also justified by his Resurrection, Obedience, Intercession, Judgement, *&c.* 2. Moreover the consequence is false on another account: Justifying faith, that is, Faith the condition of Justification, must look at more in Christ, then that which purchaseth Redemption. It justifieth not efficiently, nor of its own nature, but the Promise justifieth without faiths co-efficiency; only it makes the condition *sine qua non:* and this it may do by another Act of faith, as well as that which apprehendeth the Ransom. 3. The [*qua justificans*] I have spoke to: *Qua* cannot here properly refer to the nature of the faith, but to the Benefit. And so faith *qua justificans*, is neither this act, nor that act, nor any act; but [*qua justificans*] noteth only its respect to Justification rather then to Sanctification, or other benefits. As when I kindle a fire, I thereby occasion both Light and Heat, by putting to the fewel. And if you speak of that act of mine [*qua calefaciens*: or *qua illuminans*] this doth not distinguish of the nature of the act, but of the Respect that the same Act hath to several effects or consequents.

Mr. W. Argument 10. *If Christ only as crucified be the Meritorious Cause of our Redemption and Justification, then Christ crucified is the only object of faith as Justifying. But*---Ergo.

Answ.

Answ. 1. The consequence of the *Major* is vain and unproved. More then the Meritorious Cause of our Redemption is the object of justifying faith. 2. The *Minor* is no small errour in the Judgement of most Protestants, who maintain that Christs active Obedience, and suffering life, are also the Meritorious cause of our Justification, and not only his Crucifixion.

Mr. W. Argument 11. *If Christ as a servant did satisfie Gods Justice, then he is so to be believed on to Justification. But as a servant he did satisfie Gods Justice.* —— Ergo.

Answ. 1. I grant the conclusion. Christ as a servant is to be believed in. 2. But if [*only*] was again forgotten, I further answer. 1. I deny the consequence of the *Major*, because Christ is to be believed on for Justification in other respects, even in all essential to his Office, and not only as satisfying. I instanced before in Obeying, Rising, Judging, from expres Scripture. 2. If the conclusion were granted, its against you and not for you. For 1. Active obedience is as proper to a servant as suffering. 2. Christ *Taught* the Church as a servant to his Father, and is expresly called *A Minister of the Circumcision.* So that these you yield the objects of this faith.

Mr. W. Argument 12. *If none can call Christ* [Lord] *before he be justified by faith, then faith as justifying is not an Accepting him as Lord. The* Minor *is true, because none can call him Lord, but by the Spirit: and the Spirit is received by the hearing of faith, after we believe.*

Answ. Any thing must serve. 1. Both *Major* and *Minor* are such as are not to be swallowed in the lump. If by [*Call*] you mean the *call* of the voyce, then the consequence of the *Major* is vain and groundless. For a man may believe in Christ with the *heart* as Lord and Saviour, before he *call* him so with the mouth. But if by [*Call*] you mean [*Believe*] then the *Minor* is false & so confessed by all Protestants and Christians that

ever I heard from of this point, till now: For they all confess that faith in Christ as Lord and Teacher, and Head, &c. is the *fides qua justificat*, or is of necessity to be present with the believing in his blood, that a man may be justified. Never did I hear till now that we first believe in Christ as dying only, and so are justified before we believe in him as Lord, (and it seems before we are his Subjects or Disciples, and that is, before we are Christians.) 2. To your proof of the *Minor* I answer, 1. It is no proof because the Text saith only that, [*No man can call him Lord but by the Spirit*] but our question is of *Believing*, and not of *Calling* which is *Confessing*. 2. Many Expositors take it but for a common gift of the Spirit thats there spoken of: and do you think Justification must needs precede such common gifts? 3. But if it had been [*Believe* in stead of *Call*] its nothing for you: For I easily grant that no man can *believe* in Christ as Lord but by the Spirit: but I deny that this gift of the Spirit is never received, till after that we believe and are justified. And because it seems you judge that Believing in Christ to Justification is without the Spirit, I pray answer first what we have said against the *Arminians*, and *Augustine* against the *Pelagians*, for the contrary. Who would have thought that you had held such a point? 4. How could you wink so hard as not to see that your Argument is as much against your self as me, if you do but turn it thus? [*If none can call Christ Jesus, or the Saviour, or believe in him to Justification, before he be justified by faith, then faith as justifying is not the accepting him as a Saviour:* The *Minor* is proved, because none can call him Jesus, or believe to Justification but by the Spirit] This is as wise and strong an Argument as the other, and all one. See 1 *Joh.* 4.15. & 5.5. Believing in Christ as Saviour is as much of the Spirit, as believing in him as Lord. 5. The Text makes against you (1 *Cor.* 12.3.) For there when *Paul* would denominate the true Christian faith or Confession, he maketh Christ as Lord the Object.

Mr. W. Argument 13. *If the promise of Salvation be the proper object of justifying faith, then not the commands of Christ as Lord and Law-giver. But* —— Ergo. *Ans.*

Answ. 1. The conclusion is nothing to our Question, which is not of *Commands*, but of Christ as *Lord*. It may be you know no difference between the Relation and subsequent Duties, between the Authority and the Command, between subjection and obedience. 2. The *Minor* is false, If by *proper*, you mean *Only* (and if not, the consequence is vain and null.) For the Person of Christ, and his Office, and the fruits of his Office, even Pardon, yea and Glory, are the true Objects of justifying Faith.

Mr. W. Argument 14. *If we are not justified both by Righteousness Inherent and Imputed, then not by obeying Christ as Lord and Law-giver. But*——Ergo.

Answ. Whats this to the Question? 1. About Justification by Righteousness Imputed or Inherent we spoke before. 2. The conclusion never was acquainted with our Question? Again it seems you cannot or will not distinguish between Relative subjection and actual obedience. A man may become your servant and so have the Priviledges of a servant, by covenant, before he obey you. A woman in Marriage may subject her self to you, and have Intereſt in your estate even by that Marriage which promiseth subjection as well as Love (without excluding the first from being any condition of her Interest;) and all this before she obey you, 3. Your consequence would follow as much against your self as me. For Believing in Christ as a Ransom, is as truly a particular Inherent Righteousness, as believing in him as Lord. 4. We are justified by Righteousness Inherent as a particular righteousness, though not as a Universal: as subordinate to Christs Righteousness that it may be ours, though not in co-ordination with it.

Mr. W. Argument 15. *If our accepting of Christ as Lord and Law-giver be not properly or formally faith, nor properly to be called obedience, then we are not formally justified by faith in him as Lord, nor by our obedience to him as Lord. But such an accepting of him is not properly, or in the account of God, or in it*

ſelf Faith or obedience. Ergo.—*The Minor I prove: if purpoſes, intentions, or verbal profeſſions to believe or obey are not properly faith or obedience, then ſuch an accepting is not faith or obedience. The Minor proved. That which is or may be found in Hypocrites or Reprobates is not true faith or obedience. But* ——— Ergo.

Anſw. The Lord pardon the hardneſs of my heart that hath no móre compaſſionate ſenſe of the miſeries of that poor Church, and the diſhonour of God which ſuch Diſputes as this proclaim; by Arguments as fit to be anſwered by Tears as by words. 1. A little before he was proving (*Argument* 12.) that none could call Chriſt Lord but by the Spirit, and therefore this act was after Juſtification: And now he proveth that its common to Hypocrites, & Reprobates. 2. Here he delivereth me from all the trouble and fallacy that the diſtinction of *fides quæ Juſtificat* and *fides qua Juſtificat*, hath been guilty of. For if the act that we diſpute about, be no faith at all, then it is not the *fides quæ*. And yet he often is upon the *Qua Juſtificans* himſelf, forgetting this.

3. Had I but delivered ſuch a Doctrine as this, what ſhould I have heard? Juſtifying faith hath three Parts, ASSENT, CONSENT, and AFFIANCE, (which alſo have ſeveral acts or parts, according to the divers eſſential parts of the Object.) ASSENT is but Initial and introductory to the reſt, as all acts of the Intellect are to thoſe of the Will. CONSENT is the ſame which we here call ACCEPTING, which is but the meer VOLITION denominated from its reſpect to the offer and thing offered. This, as it is in the will, the commanding Faculty, ſo is it as it were the Heart of Faith; the firſt act being but to lead in this, and AFFIANCE the third, being commanded much by this, or depending on it: For as it is ſeated in the Affections, ſo far it is diſtinct from this *Velle* or CONSENT. Now when ever we name *Faith* by any one of theſe three acts (as the Scripture doth from every one) we include them all, though to avoid tediouſneſs we ſtand not to name all the parts, when ever by one word we expreſs the whole. And all theſe Acts have whole

Chriſt

Christ in all the essentials of his Person and office for their object. Now that this faith in Christ as Lord, or accepting him, should be said, and that by a Christian Divine, and that in the Reformed Church, to be no faith at all, (to say nothing of his denying it to be obedience;) is no matter of honour or comfort to us. How oft doth the Scripture expressly mention faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? Receiving Christ Jesus the Lord, *Col.*2.6. with other equipollent terms. But I will not offer to trouble any Christian Reader with Arguments for such a Truth.

4. But yet the man would be thought to have Reason for what he saith; and to his proof I further answer. 1. *Purposes*, *Intentions*, and *verbal Professions* were none of the terms or things in question: but *Accepting* or *Believing in Christ as Lord*, *Teacher*, &c. These are but concomitants (the two first) and (the last) a consequent. 2. Is it the Act [*Accepting*] that this Brother disputeth against, or is it the Object [*Christ as Lord*] as being none of the faith by which we are justified? If it be the former, 1. What Agreement then hath this Argument with all the rest, or with his question? 2. What Agreement hath his Judgement with the holy Scripture, that calleth Faith *a Receiving of Christ*, and maketh it equipollent with [*Believing in his Name*] John 1.11,12. Col.2.6. 3. What Agreement hath his Judgement with the Protestant Faith, that maketh Christ himself as Good to be the Object of faith; to be embraced, or chosen, or accepted by the will, as well as the word as True, to be Assented to by the understanding. But if it be the *Object* that he meaneth, then what force or sense is there in his Argument, from the terms, [*Purposing*, *Intending*, *Confessing?*] Let him name what Act he please, so it respect this Object; and if it be an Act of faith indeed, its all one as to our present Controversie. If he take *Consent*, *willing*, or *Accepting* of Christ to be no act of Faith, let him name any other that he will own (for I would *quarrel* as little as may be about words, or impertinent things,) and let that be it.

4. And how could he choose but see, that his Argument is as much against [*Accepting Christ as Priest*] as against [*Accepting him as Lord*] to Justification? No doubt but a man that

that had the common Reason to write but such a book as this, must needs see this if he regard what he said. And therefore I must take it for granted that his Argument is against both alike: even to prove that Accepting of Christ as Lord, or as Saviour, is no faith or obedience at all. But the Reader will hardly believe till he weigheth it, that a waking man would reason thus upon such a Question as this in hand.

5. Consenting that Christ shall be my Lord and Teacher, and Head, doth imply a consent, and so a Purpose of future obeying, learning and receiving from him; And so consenting that Christ shall be my Righteousness, Intercessor, and Justifier, doth imply a Purpose of Trusting in him for the future. And yet this consent in both cases is Justifying faith.

6. And its dolefull Doctrine (were he a true Prophet) to all Gods Church, that *Purposes and Intentions to believe and obey, are no more then may be found in Hypocrites or Reprobates.* For though there are superficial uneffectual *purposes and Intentions* in them, as there is an uneffectual faith in them; yet if no Purposes and Intentions will prove men Saints, then nothing in this world will prove them Saints; For the Evidences of Grace are more certain to him that hath them, in the Heart then in the outward Actions. And in the Heart, the very new Creature lyeth much in these two. Desires themselves will prove true Grace: Much more when they rise to setled Purposes. Why else did *Barnabas* exhort the young beginners, that [*With purpose of Heart they should cleave unto the Lord*] as intimating that their stability lay in this; And *Intentions* are the very Heart of the New man. For Intention is that act that is exercised about the End, which is God himself. *Intendere finem*, is no more then *Velle vel Amare Deum*; It is the Love of God above all. And if this be common to Hypocrites and Reprobates, what a case are we in then?

I hope I have given you a sufficient account of the Impertinency and vanity of Mr. *Warners* fifteen Arguments. To which he adjoyneth a rabble of the words of *Socinians, Arminians*, and I know not who, to assure you that we his new Adversaries, do joyn with that company and plead their cause: And he

he that will believe him, shall no further be disturbed by me in his belief.

I doubt I have wearied the Reader already, and therefore I shall only add a few words about a few more of the most considerable passages in his Book.

Some other of Mr. Warners *passages of most importance considered.*

Pag. 385. MR. W. saith [*Its worth the observing how to evade the Distinction of the Acts of faith, he saith that faith is one act in a moral sense, as Taking a man to be my Prince, Teacher, Physitian,* &c. *and not in a physical sence; for so it is many acts,* &c.] And he confuteth me thus: [*Here, Reader, see the wit or forgetfulness of the man; who to maintain his own ground, doth often consider faith as Physically seated in the understanding and Will; but when we assault him, will not allow us, any Physical, but a moral Acception of it.*]

Answer A most gross untruth! (and thats an Arguing that Faith needeth not) Your forgery is not only without ground, and contrary to my plain and frequent words, but contrary to the expres words that you draw your Observation from. I say faith Physically taken, is many acts; but morally taken it is one work: Hence you call out to the Reader to observe, that I will not allow you any Physical but a Moral Acception of it.] Is it fit to Dispute with such dealing as this? Do you think that I or any man of brains doth doubt whether faith be a Physical Act (except them of late that take it to be but a Passion and a Nominal action?) Surely all know that it is an Act in order of Nature, before it is a moral act. *Actus moralis*, is first *actus Physicus*. Though *Moraliter actus, i. e. actus Reputativus*, may be but a non-acting Physically: He that wilfully famisheth his own child, doth kill him morally or reputatively, and so is *moraliter agens*, that is, Reputative. But he that cherisheth him is an Agent natural and moral, that is,

Ethical or Vertuous. I wonder what made you think me of such an opinion that I have so much wrote against?

He next saith, that [*Though by one moral act we receive divers benefits, yet We receive them to divers purposes.*] *Answer*, True! But many such passages of yours are to no purpose; and such is this: impertinent to the business.

Page 391. He comes to my Distinction, where I say, that *ex parte Christi* he satisfieth Justice as a Ransom, and Teacheth us as our Master, and Ruleth us as our King, yet *ex parte nostri*, it is but one and the same entire faith that is the condition of our Title to his several benefits: From hence he ingeniously gathereth that I say, [*That faith hath but one respect to those benefits, and is not diversified by several acts; and deny the necessity of these distinct acts in reference to the several benefits of Christ.*] Whereas I only maintained, that though the acts be Physically distinct, yet they are not distinct conditions of our Interest in the benefits, but the same entire faith is the one condition of them all. Hereupon he learnedly addresseth himself to prove that faith hath several acts. And he that thinketh it worth his time to transcribe and confute his Arguments, let him do it, for I do not.

Page 401. He thinks [*We need not dispute whether the Reception of Christ by faith, be moral or Physical: however it is not an improper, but proper reception.*] *Answ.* 1. It seems then we need not dispute whether Christs body be every where, and whether mans faith do touch him and receive him naturally as the mouth doth the meat? 2. And whereas *Recipere*, in its first and proper signification was wont to be *pati*, now it is *agere*: And whereas consent or Acceptance was wont to be called Receiving but Metonymically, now it is becoma a proper Reception.

Page 303.304. Reasoning against me, he saith, [*The nearest formal Reason of a Believers Interest, is not Gods making it a condition, Which is the remote reason thereof, but a Believers fulfilling the condition,* &c.] *Answ.* 1. Here he changeth the question, from [*What is the neareſt reaſon of faiths Intereſt*] to [*What is the neareſt reaſon of the Believers Intereſt.*] To the first I say, [*Its being made the condition of the Promise.*] To the second

second I say, [*The Promise orgrant it self.*] 2. He findeth a learned Confutation for me, *viz.* That it is not *Gods making*, but the *fulfilling* the *condition* that is the formal Reason. *Answ.* Performance, that is, Believing maketh faith to be faith, and exist; but the Promise makes that the condition. I spoke *de esse*, and he *de existere*: And yet I usually say, that [*The neareſt Reason of faiths intereſt in Juſtification, is, as it is the condition of the Promiſes fulfilled*] that I might joyn both. 3. Note that in this his Assertion he granteth me the sum of all that I desire. For if this be true, then it is not the Nature or the Instrumentality of faith that is the neareſt reason, as is usually said.

Page 200. He doth as solemnly call his Adversarie *ad partes*, as if he were in good sadness to tell him what is the causality of works in Justification: And falling to his enumeration, he tells us that [*The particle A or Ab notes the peculiar cauſality of the efficient: the particle Ex notes the material cauſe: the particle Per or By, the formal cauſe: the particle Propter, the final cauſe.*] *Answ.* I must crave pardon of the Reader while I suppose all this to be currant, that I may answer *ad hominem*. And then 1. It seems faith is not the efficient cause, and therefore not the Instrumental cause: For *A* or *ab* is not affixed to it, in this business. 2. It seems then that faith is the formal cause of Justification, because we are said to be Justified διὰ πίστεως *Rom.*3.22 25,30, *& paſſim* [By Faith] So that faith is come to higher promotion then to be an Instrumental efficient cause. 3. Hence it seems also that faith, even the same faith is [*the material cauſe*] too: For most certainly we are said to be justified *ex fide*: ἐκ πίστεως: *Rom.*3.26,30. *Rom.*5.1. *Gal.*2.16: &3.8,7,5,9,22 24.& 5.5. *Jam.*2.24. Whether *ex fide* ἐκ πίστεως do indeed expresse an *Instrumental efficient*, I leave to consideration: But sure I am it fitly expresseth the Intereſt of a condition. And if Mr. *W.* will needs advance faith hereby to be the *matter* of our Righteousness, it must be but of our subordinate particular Evangelical righteousness, which consisteth in fulfilling the condition of Justification.

*Chap.*5.*pag.*29.30,31. He spends a Chapter to open to us the meaning of [*fides qua Juſtificat.*] And professeth that it is the *Cardo controverſiæ*; yea it was the remembrance of

this distinction and the light he received by it that induced him to enter on this Discourse; and that it is the basis of his following exercitation. And what think you is the happy Light that deserveth all this ostentation? Why 1. On the Negative we are satisfied that he means not [*What fides qua fides can do*:] And then we are secure that he means nothing that can hurt his Adversaries cause. 2. The Light then is all but this [*That qua here is not taken Reduplicative, but specificative, when by the particle* qua *or* quatenus, *there is some new or singular kind of Denomination added to the subject of the Proposition: as when we say, man as a reasonable creature feeleth: In this latter sence* (saith he) *I believe the particle* qua *or* quatenus *is taken, when we do not say, faith as faith, but faith as justifying*, viz. *as a Grace designed to this act or operation of justifying, looks on Christ as Saviour.*]

Answ. This Chapter was worth the observing. For if this be the Basis of all the Exercitation, and the Light that Generated all the rest, the dispatch of this may serve for all. It seems by his words he had look't into *Reebe's Distinctions* in the end of *Castaneus*, and meeing with *Reduplicative* and *Specificative*, admired the distinction as some rare Discovery: and this pregnant fruitful Distinction begot a Volume, before it was half understood it self. Had he but read the large Schemes for explaining *Qua* or *Quatenus* in others, its like it would have either begot a larger Volume, or by informing or confounding him, have prevented this. First, he disowneth the *Reduplicative* sence; and then owneth the *Specificative*. But 1. He seeth not, it seems, the insufficiency of this distinction; 2. Nor the meaning of it; 3. Nor could well apply it to the subject in hand. Of the first I shall speak anon. The second appeareth by his Description, his Instance, and his Application. He describeth it to be [*When there is some new or singular kind of Denomination added to the subject of the Proposition.*] 1. And why may it not be added also to the Predicate, as well as it may *Reduplicatively*? as *Motus est actus mobilis quatenus est mobile.*

2. There are many new kinds of Denominations that will not serve for your *Specificative Quatenus*. The instance you give is, [*as when we say man as a Reasonable creature faileth.*]

This

This was but an unhappy Translation of [*Homō quatenus animal est sensibilis*] and its true in the Latine, how false soever in the English. For the Application, 1. You say [you [*Believe*] *its thus taken*. As if you did but *Believe*, and not know your own meaning in the *Basis* of your Exercitation. 2. Your *Specificative Quatenus* is *Causal*, or signifieth the Reason of the thing, either of the Predication or the thing predicate: But so cannot your Basis hold good. For faith doth not *look on* Christ as a Saviour (as you please Metaphorically to speak) *because* it Justifieth: for its Nature is before the effect, and therefore cannot the effect be given as the cause of it; (unless it were the final cause, of which anon.)

Qua or quatenus properly and according to the common use signifieth the proper reason of the thing or predication; and is appliable only to that which is spoken κατὰ παντὸς. As to the terms, sometimes there is a Reduplication of the *same term*, sometimes that reduplication is of the *matter*, but in *other terms*, as in a definition, or synominal words, or it is implyed: sometimes it is the terms of the *Predicate* or *Attribute* that is Reduplicate; sometimes it is *without* a *Reduplication*: And then sometimes it giveth a Reason from an *Essential Part*: sometime from the *Generical Nature*; sometime from the *Specifick Nature*: sometime from an *Accident*: and those are divers: sometime from a *Quality*: sometime from *Quantity*: sometime from *Relation*; and that is *multifarious*: If we should run into all the sences of this Term which Mr. *W.* doth lap up in the word [*Specificative*] the words might exceed the profit. And its to be noted that usually the term is respective as to some other thing excluded which is contradistinct: & so we give sometimes a more *Remote and General*, & sometime a neerer and more special Reason by *Qua or quatenus*. As if you mix a purging Electuary in your *Drink*, I say that Purgeth *quatenus medicated*, which is to exclude the *Drink* from being Purgative. If I speak of the *Electuary*, I may say that it purgeth *quatenus Diagridiate*, to exclude many other Ingredients from being Purgative. But if I speak of the *Diagridium*, I may say that it Purgeth as having an *Elective faculty*, &c. to exclude other Reasons of its operation.

Now for the opening of the matter in hand, let us try certain Propositions that may be supposed to be laid down concerning Faith.

[1. *Faith as faith justifieth*] This is *True*, taken *laxely*, for the excluding of [*faith as a meer Physical act, or meritorious*, &c.] but it is *false strictly* taken, as signifying the formal or neareſt reaſon.

So [2. *Fides in Christum qua talis justificat*] that is, *hæc fides in specie*] is *true*, taken *Laxely and materially* to exclude all other Faith: *q. d. It is not faith in* Peter *or* Paul, *but faith in Christ as such that is the matter deputed, to be the condition of Justification.* But its *false* taken *strictly, de ratione formali.*

3. So [*This faith as it is an Apprehenſion or Acceptance of Christ, justifieth.*] Its true, *Materialiter & Remotius, Laxly:* but *false formaliter & stricte de ratione proxima.* For this is the ſame in other terms with the ſecond.

So [4. *Faith justifieth as an Inſtrumental efficient cauſe of our Juſtification.*] Its *false* in every tolerable ſence.

So [5. *Faith juſtifieth as an Inſtrument of receiving Chriſt.*] Its true, 1. taking the word [*Inſtrument*] Metaphorically, and meaning only the *Nature of this faith*, which is [*to Believe in and Accept Chriſt.*] 2. and taking *Quatenus remotely, laxely* and *materially* only, q.d. *Faith is the Elected matter of the condition* (or is choſen to be the condition of Juſtification) *for this Aptitude, as, or becauſe it is a Reception or Acceptance of Chriſt.* But its falſe, 1. Taking an [*Inſtrument*] *ſtrictly and Logically*, 2. and ſpeaking *de ratione formali.*

So [6. *Faith as a believing in Chriſts ſacrifice, juſtifieth.*] Its true, *Laxly, Materialiter & partialiter*: that is, *This act of faith is part of the matter of the condition.* But its falſe, *formaliter de ratione proxima.*

So [7. *Faith juſtifieth only as it is a Believing in Chriſts ſacrifice or Righteouſneſs.*] Its falſe both *de materia & de ratione formali.*

So [8. *Faith as Juſtifying is only a Believing in, or Accepting Chriſt as our Ranſom.*] Here is darkneſs, and either nonſence or falſe doctrine. 1. [*As Juſtifying*] ſignifieth either [*as a juſtifying efficient cauſe*] 2. Or [*as the merit or matter of*

our

our Righteousness.] 3. Or [*as the means i. e. condition of our Righteousness, of which Justification is a consequent and final cause.*] In the first sense it is every way false. In the second sense it is every way false, speaking of our Universal Righteousness. In the third sense, if spoken *laxely de materia*, its false, because of the exclusive [*Only.*] And if spoken *de ratione formali vel proximâ*, 1. Its preposterous to put the Consequent before the Antecedent, if you speak *de ordine exequendi*: 2. And it is false: For [*qua Justificans*] speaketh of Justification as the consequent, or as an act, and not of the Nature of Faith it self. And therefore [*qua Justificans*] faith *is nothing* (much less that act alone.) For it is not *de esse fidei* that the term speaks, but of the consequent; So that the [*Fides qua justificans est*] what ever act you mention, is absurd and unsound: For as *non justificat quatenus est, ita non est quatenus Justificat*, its Essence being pre-supposed. But if you speak *de ordine Intentionis*, viz. [*Faith as elected a means or condition of Justification is only a Believing in Christs sacrifice.*] then *Laxely & Materially* it would be *True*, if it were not for the [*only.*] But because of that it is false, both *de materia & de ratione formali.* The nature of it is before its Office.

So [9. *Faith as designed to this act or operation of Justifying, looks on Christ as a Saviour.*] This is Mr. *Ws.* Assertion. But 1. *justifying* is not an *act or operation* of *faith*; but of *God* on the Believer. 2. But if you mean but constituting it the condition of Justification, then 1. the wrong end is set first: For it doth not look at Christ, as its made the condition; but its made the condition, because being an Accepting of Christ, its Apt for that Office. So that *Materially and Laxely*, its thus true; (a Saviour, comprehendeth Christs Kingly and Prophetical Offices, and everlasting Priesthood in Heaven) But this is nothing to the formal Reason of its Interest in Justification.

But lest you think that [*qua Justificans*] hath no proper place, I further instance [9. *Faith as justifying is distinct from faith as entitling to Heaven, or other promised mercies.*] This is true (supposing Justification and the said Title to Glory to differ.) But this is but a denomination of the same faith from

its

its divers consequents. As my lighting a candle being one action is *Actio illuminans (ut causa moralis,) & calefaciens; & qua illuminans non est calefaciens.* So a womans marrying a Prince, is an Honouring, enriching act: and *qua honouring*, it is not *enriching*. But its the same entire undivided act or Antecedent Means, or Condition, that is thus variously denominated from several Benefits. And thus Relations may give divers denominations to the same person; the same man may be considered as a Father, as a Physitian, as a Subject, *&c.*

So 10. FAITH WHICH IS AN EFFECTUAL ACCEPTANCE OF and AFFIANCE IN CHRIST AS CHRIST, *was* CHOSEN and ORDAINED *by God the Condition of Justification and Life, because his Wisdom saw it fit for that Office, and that fitness lyeth in its respect to the Object and Gods ends* (supposing we may assign Reasons or causes of Gods Will.) *By this faith* (so constituted the Condition) *we are actually* JUSTIFIED AS TIS THE PERFORMED CONDITION OF GODS PROMISE.] This is the plain Truth in few and easie words.

By what is said you may see that when they say [*faith as Justifying*] is this or that, it is both prepostorous, and the [*qua*] as distinct from the [*quæ*] *de ratione formali*, causally spoken, is plainly false: But in other cases, *Laxely and Materially*, the [*qua*] signifieth the same as the [*quæ*] with the exclusion of other matter. And when they have raised never so great a dust, the Question is but this: *Whether we are justified by Believing in Christ as Christ, or only in Christ as a Ransom*] (and yet as a Ransom and as dying he purchaseth Sanctification as well as Justification.) Or. [*Whether faith in Christ as Christ, or only faith in Christ as Purchasing Justification, be the condition of our Justification.*]

Reader, Having shewed the darkness of that Light that caused Mr. *Ws.* Exercitation, and overthrown its Basis, I shall put thee to no further trouble.

To

To my Reverend Brother Mr. *John Warner*, Preacher of the Gospel at Christs Church in *Hantshire*.

Sir,

THough (through the privacy of my habitation) I never so much as heard of your name, before your Book of the Object *and* Office *of faith was in the Press; yet upon the perusal of it I confidently conclude, that a zeal for God, and that which you verily think to be his Truth, hath moved you to this undertaking; and doubtless you think that you have done God service by it. I love your zeal: and your indignation against Error; and your tenderness of so great a point as that of Justification. And could I find your Light to be answerable to your heat, I hope I should also love and honour it: Had you not taken me (with the two Reverend Brethren whom you oppose) to be* the enemies of the person and Grace of the Lord Jesus, or the followers of them (*as you say, Epist. pag.* 6.) *I am perswaded you would not have either called us so, or thought your self called to this assault. And if I love Christ, I must love that man that hateth me, though mistakingly, for the sake of Christ. That principle within you that hath made Christ and Truth so dear to you, that you rise up for that which seemeth to you to be Truth, I hope will grow till you attain perfection in that world of Light that will end our differences. I shall not go about to deprecate your indignation for my plain expressions in this Defence, when the nature of your matter did require them: For I am not so unreasonable as to expect that fair words should reconcile a good man to those that he takes to be enemies to Christ, or to their followers. But as I can truly say if I know what is in my heart, that the Reading of your Book hath*

bred no enmity to you in my breſt, but only kindled a love to your zeal, with a compaſſion of your darkneſs, and a diſlike of your ſo much confidence in the dark; ſo it ſhall be my care as it is my duty, to love you as a miſtaken ſervant of Chriſt, though you ſhould take me for his greateſt enemy. And therefore being conſcious of no worſe affections to you, I deſire that Juſtice of you, as to impute the ungrateſull paſſages that you meet with, to my apprehenſion of the badneſs of your cauſe and Arguments, and a compaſſion to the poor Church that muſt be troubled and tempted, and endaxgered by ſuch groſs miſtakes, and not to any contempt of your perſon, with which I meddle not, but as you are the Author of thoſe Arguments.

In your Preface I find a Law impoſed by you on your Anſwerer, which I have not fully obſerved: 1. Becauſe I had written my Reply to your Arguments a conſiderable time before I ſaw your Preface; For it fell out that I firſt ſaw your Book without the Epiſtle and Preface. 2. Becauſe I thought it fitteſt to follow the Method that my Subject and the Readers Edification did require. 3. Yet did I once purpoſe to have anſwered all that was of moment in your Book againſt the Truth: but upon trial I found your Reaſons ſo inconſiderable, that wearineſs interrupted me and put an end to my Reply, and withal I grew confident that my labour would be to little purpoſe. For I dare venture any Judicious Divine upon your Book without the help of a Reply: And for the reſt, it is not replying that will ſerve turn: but either prejudice will hold them to the ſide that they have taken, or elſe they will think him in the right that hath the laſt word: When they have read mine, they will think that I am in the right; and when they have again read yours, they will think that you carry the cauſe: and when they read my Reply again, they will ſay, you were miſtaken; but uſually they will go with the party that is in greateſt credit, or hath moſt intereſt in them, or advantage on them. But yet I think you will find that none of your ſtrength againſt me is neglected: For I can truly ſay, that when I think not meet to Anſwer all that a man hath ſaid, I never paſs by that which I take to be his ſtrength, but purpoſely call out that, and leave that which I think is ſo groſly weak as to need no anſwer: So much of your ten Demands or Laws as I apprehended neceſſary, I have

here

here answered; supposing what I had said of the same points in my first Disputation, which I saw no Reason too often to Repeat.

I am none of those that blame you for too much of the Metaphysicks, *but rather marvail that you feared not lest your Metaphysical Reader will wrong you by mis-applying your cited* Schegkius *contrary to your better opinion of your self, and take both your* Schegkius *and your* Scaliger *for Prophets that could speak as if they had read your Book, and been acquainted with your arguings. But it seems you are not the first of that way.*

By your Arguments in your Preface, I perceive you think it a matter of very great moment to your cause, to prove that there are divers acts of Faith, whereas I am so far from denying it, that I am ready to demonstrate, that even the faith by which We are Justified, is liker to have twenty acts then one only, but many certainly it hath. Your first Argument is, from the different objects, because the Objects specifie the Acts. A sufficient Argument which no man can confute. But 1. *This is no proof, that one act only is it that we are justified by.* 2. *Where you add that Justifying Faith hath not respect to Christ as Lord* formaliter, *you beg the Question, and assert no light mistake. But where you add* in its act of Justifying *you do but obtrude upon us your fundamental Error (which leadeth you to the rest) by naked affirmations. Faith hath properly no justifying act:* Justificare est efficere, *Faith doth not effect our Justification: We are justified by faith indeed, but not as by an efficient cause unless you will take Justification for Sanctification; For real qualitative Mutations it doth effect; but the* Jus *or Title to any mercy in the world it cannot* Effect, *but* Accept *when offered. If you cannot see so plain a Truth in its Evidence, yet observe by the words of the Reverend Brother that is my Opponent in the second Disputation, and by your Prefacers Dr.* Kendals *course, that it's a passive instrumentality that the Defenders of your cause at last are driven to; and therefore talk not of* its act of Justifying *unless you will mean* Gods act of Justifying which faith is the Condition of. *And whereas you make* unbelief to be formally a slighting and neglecting Christ as a Saviour and effectively *(you must mean* only *effective & non formaliter)* a denying subjection to him

as Lord. *You err so great but so rare an error, that I suppose it needless to confute it. All Christians as far as I can learn have been till now agreed, that Believing in Christ as Prophet and King is a real part of faith, and that unbelief or rejecting him as Prophet and King is a real part of unbelief.*

Your second Argument is from the different subjects; *where you give us two such palpable Fictions, that its a wonder you can make your self believe them, much more that you should lay so great a stress on such absurdities. The first is that the* Act of Faith is in several faculties: *and you elsewhere give us to understand that it is* one Physical Act *that you mean. And do you think in good sadness that one single Physical act can be the act of both the faculties? The second is that* the fear, love and obedience to Christ as King is but in the Will. *But* 1. *What Readers do you expect, that will take an Assertion of* Fear, Love, and Obedience, *in stead of an assertion concerning* Faith? *Were you not comparing faith in Christ as King, with faith in Christ as Priest only? And why speak you not of faith in one part of your comparison, as well as in the other? Your conclusion now is nothing to the Question?* 2. *Or if you mean that* Faith in Christ as King is not in both faculties, *as well as* Faith in Christ as Priest or sacrifice, *did you think that any man of ordinary understanding would ever believe you without any proof? or that ever such a thing can be proved?*

Your third Argument is, [Because they are in a different time exerted; the one, that is, Faith as Justifying, being precedaneous to the other, *(and to other Graces)*] Answ. *Wonderfull! Is that man justified that believeth not in Christ as the King and Prophet of the Church? Do you believe this your self? why then an Infidel is justified by Faith. The Belief in Christ as a Sacrifice or Priest* only, *is not the Christian faith; it is not faith in Christ properly, because it is not faith in Christ as Christ. For Christ as Priest only is not Christ. A* Heart *only is not* Corpus humanum: *A* Body *only is not a* Man; *Where there are three essential parts, one of them is not the Thing, without the rest. The name* [Jesus Christ] *signifieth the office as well as the person. It is essential to that Office, that he be Prophet and King. And hereby you shew that you do not only* distinguish *but* divide. *For where there*

there is a distance of time between the Acts, there is a division. Do you think that we are Christs enemies, or followers of them, unless we will believe you that a man is Justified by Believing in Christ only as a Priest or Ransom, or in his Righteousness, before ever he believe in him as King and Lord (and so as Teacher, &c.) If I had said that you are Christs enemy for such Doctrine, which, think you, had had the fairer pretence for his censure? But I am far from saying so, or thinking it. I know that the Assent to the essential Articles of Christianity, containeth many Acts, and that our Consent and Affiance are many Physical Acts, as the parts of Christs Office are many Objects. But yet I (do not think, *but) am* certain *that all these physical Acts concur to make up that Moral Act which is called Christian, or saving, or Justifying Faith; and that he that believeth not in Christ as to all that is essential to Christ, is no Christian. And a man is not justified by Faith before he is a Christian. And truly Sir, men that are loth to flie from the Light, and that love the Truth, and diligently seek it (as heartily, if not as happily as you) must yet needs tell you, that if you produce your Mormolucks an hundred times, and cant over and over* [a Papist, a Socinian, an Arminian; and an Arminian, a Socinian and a Papist] *their understandings will never the more be perswaded to embrace your Delusions, though you should say that the Kingdom of God doth consist in them.*

Your fourth Argument is that, [There is a difference in Nature, Efficacy, Energy, and Operation; therefore the Acts are not the same.] Answ. 1. *I maintained the conclusion (that faith hath different Acts) before ever I heard of your name; and have no reason now to denie it.* 2. *The difference of Nature, I grant you between many Acts of faith; but what you mean by the* Efficacy, Energy, and Operation, *he that knows can tell; for I cannot.*

But still I desire you to know that I deny faith to have any efficient operation in justifying us, or that it is an efficient cause of our Justification; especially its no Physical efficient; you add a strange proof of your Assertion, [viz. For faith as Justifying makes a mystical Union and relative change on the person; but faith as working and sanctifying produceth a moral union with Christ, *&c.*] *Answ.* 1. *Faith as justifying doth only Justi-*

fie, and produce no Union; the same faith as uniting is the means of Union. 2. *The question is of* [Faith in Christ as Priest, and faith in Christ as Prophet and King also.] *And you talk of* [faith as justifying, and as working and sanctifying] *A small alteration.* 3. *What* Mystical Relative Union *is that which is not a* Moral Union? 4. *Faith in Christ as Christ, and not as a Ransom only, is the means of our Justification; And you give us nothing like a proof of the contrary restriction.*

In the same Preface you tell the world of a threefold Artifice that we use; the first is [to set up a second Justification] *Ans. Is it the Name or the Thing that you mean? If the name,* 1. *cite the words where we use that Name.* 2. *If it answer the subject, you may bear with the name. If it be the* Thing, *then tell us what Religion that it that denyeth* 1. *a Justification by sentence at Judgement.* 2. *Gods continual justifying us to the Death.* 3. *And his particular pardoning or justifying us from the guilt of renewed particular sins.* 4. *And that faith is not only in the first act, but through all our lives, the means of our Justification; Or, justifying faith is more* then *one instantaneous Act; or a man ceaseth not to have justifying faith after the first Act or moment. Tell us who those be, and what Religion they are of that deny all these, that Christians may be acquainted with them, if they be worthy their acquaintance.*

Our second Artifice is, [to require Works only as Gospel-Conditions.] Answ. *Would you have us say* more *of them, or* less? *if less, I have said enough of it in the second Disputation.*

Our third Artifice is, [To include works in the Definition of Justifying faith, making it a receiving of Christ as Saviour, Lord and Law-giver to Justification; as also confounding our consummate Salvation or Glorification with our Justification.] Ans. *Gross untruths! contrary to large and plaine expressions of my mind in several Volumes (if you mean me, as you know I have reason to judge)* 1. *I ever took Works to be a fruit of faith, and no part of it, unless you take the word* Faith *improperly and laxely; unless by* [Works] *you mean* [Acts] *And you take faith for such a Work your self, that is, an* Act. 2. *I expressly distinguished what you say I confound; Consummate Sanctification*

tion or Glorification, and consummate Justification. But yet as I do in the Definition include Consent to Christs Lordship, *though not* Obedience (*thats only* implyed *to be a necessary consequent,*) *so I still say that much of your Justification is yet to come; And if your Religion teach you to say, that you will be beholding to Christ for no more Justification, so doth not mine.*

And whereas you cite some that say, that all our sins are pardoned in our first believing, as if I had questioned any such thing, I must tell you that I easily grant it, that every sin is then forgiven, and so far as that Justification is perfect; but what have you yet said to prove, 1. *That we are never justified by faith, but in that one instant.* 2. *That We need no particular Justification from particular sins that after shall be committed.* 3. *Nor no sentential Justification at Judgement, which Mr.* Burges *will tell you, is the chief. You and others use to say, that, that at Judgement, is but* Declarative. *But* 1. *It is no common* Declaration, *but a Declaration by the* Judge. 2. *And the Sentence doth more then meerly declare; for it doth finally decide, acquit and adjudge to Glory.* 3. *And methinks this* Declarative *should be no term of Diminution, but of Aggravation, with those that still use to say that* Justification *is a judiciary Term. Alas! That these matters among the friends of Christ and Truth, should need so many words.*

Some more I had to say to you, but you may find it in the Preface to these Disputations. I only add, that if indeed it be true which you write to that Honourable person, to whom you dedicate your Labors, viz. *That the Subject of your Discourse is so excellent and necessary to be known; and that* He who is Ignorant of the Object and Office of Faith, doth neither know what he believeth, nor how he is justified; *I should think it is high time, that you call your Understanding once more to an account, and review the Fabrick that you have built on* a qua justificans *not understood, or upon a* specificative quatenus, *where there is no such thing: And if you think me unfit to be hearkned to in this, (as being one of the* men of perverse minds *that there you mention,) its more worthy your industry, to seek the advice of the learned Oxford Divines herein, then*

that,

that they should be sought to approve and midwife such a Book into the world: and its likely that their Charity will provoke them to be serviceable to you in this; though I hear that their Discretion forbad them the other. For all men are not so easily whistled into a Christs-Church contention against the Truth and Church of Christ, as Dr. K. *and one or two Confidents, that living in a cold and steril Country, are less substantive, and more adjective, then Innocents and Independents use to be.*

None's here so fruitfull as the Leaning Vine:
And what though some be drunken with the Wine?
They'l fight the better, if they can but hit:
And lay about them without fear or——) But stay!

See what Example is! As the name of Dr. K. *and the remembrance of his* dissertatiuncula (*an* Appendant *to* fax pro Tribunali, *that could* salva fide, fidem solvere) *began to tice me into a jocound vein; so your concluding Poetry had almost tempted me in an Apish imitation to* Poetize, *when weariness made me think of a conclusion. Bus I had rather conclude with this serious motion to you (that my end may meet your beginning,) that before you next write on this Subject, you will better consider of the question that your* qua justificans *concerneth: And instead of telling us, that* fides qua justificans respicit Christum Salvatorem, *that is,* fides qua justificans est fides, *as if it were* justifying *in order of Nature before it is* Faith: *you will be pleased to tell us,* sub qua ratione fides justificat (vel fide justificamur?) *Whether you will say, that* fides qua justificans, justificat, *or* fides qua fides justificat, *(which I think you disown,) or* fides qua respicit, apprehendit, recipit Christum, *which is all one, as* fides qua fides, *or* fides qua Instrumentum apprehendens, *which Metaphorical expression still signifieth no more then* [qua credit in Christum, *or* qua fides?] *Or whether you will stand to what you have affirmed.* chap. 9. pag. 67. *that its* Gods assignation of it to the office, who therefore

therefore doth it, becauſe he wills it : *and to What you ſaid*, pag. 304. The meereſt formal reaſon of a Believers Intereſt to pardon, is —— a Believers fulfilling the condition. *And if you will ſtand to this that you have ſaid, and underſtand that the Doctrine of us Whom you aſſault is the ſame (more carefully expreſſed,) be intreated then to let your next bolt be ſhot at the right mark: Which is all thats now requeſted of you, by*

Your Chriſtian Brother (whether you will or no)

RICHARD BAXTER.

Decemb. 25.
1657.

Richard Baxters
DISCVSSION
OF Mr
John Tombes his Friendly, Acceptable
ANIMADVERSIONS
ON HIS
Aphorisms, and other Writings.

About the Nature of *Justification*, and of justifying *Faith*.

LONDON,
Printed by *R.W.* for *Nevil Simmons*, Book-seller in *Kederminster*, and are to be sold by him there, and by *Nathaniel Ekins*, at the Gun in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1658.

Richard Baxter's

DISCUSSION

OF HIS

Sir,

UPON reading of the Postscript in your late Book, I have sent you these Animadversions. You say Aphor. of Justification, *pag.* 184. [*All those Scriptures which speak of Justification as done in this life, I understand of Justification in Title of Law. So Rom.* 5.1. and 4.2. and 5.9. *Jam.* 2.21, 25, *&c.*] I conceive Justification, being Gods Act, *Rom.* 8.30, *Rom.*8.33. consequent upon Faith, and calling, and importing a sentence opposite to Condemnation; *Rom.*8.30,33,34. and 5.1. terminated on particular persons, *Rom.* 4.2,3 *Rom.*8.30 it must be more then the Vertual Justification in Law-Title; which is only an act of God prescribing or promising a way of Justification, not the sentence it self, and is general, and indeterminate to particular persons, and is performed before the person justified believes: Yea is the same, though none were actually justified: and therefore in my apprehension, that Act of Gods Covenanting or promising, in which I conceive you place the Justification by Law-Title. *Thes.* 38. Is not the Justification by faith meant, *Rom.*5.1. *&c.*

Besides, to be justified notes a Passion, which presupposeth an Action; an Act Transient, not Immanent; or only Gods purpose to justifie: nor can it be Gods Promise to justifie:

For the Act, though it be Transient, yet it is only a Declaration what he will do; his promise to justifie upon condition, is not Justifying, and therefore a man is not by the Covenant, without a further Act, Denominated Justified, though he be made justifyable by it. I conceive Justification is a Court term, Importing an Act of God as Judge, whereas his promising is not his Act as Judge, but *Rector*, *thes.* 42. you mention the Angels judging us Righteous, and Rejoycing therein; which whence it should be, but by a sentence passed in Heaven, I know not. Constitutive Justification, different from Declarative by sentence, I do not find expressed under the term [*Justification*] It would be considered whether any other Act besides the sentence, doth make a man just, but giving of faith; notwithstanding Christs Death, and the conditional Covenant before faith, a person is only justifyable; *Conditionalis nihil ponit in esse.* A person is upon giving of Faith justified; but not by giving of faith (thats an act of Sanctification) but by a sentence of God, *Thes.* 59. You make justification a continned act; now it being a transient act, I suppose it may not be well called a continued Act, which imports a successive motion between the *terminus a quo*, and *terminus ad quem*; whereas the act, whether by sentence, or Covenant, is not such a Motion. Its not to be denyed, that the Benefit and Vertue of it is continued, but I think not the Act. If it be not *semel*, but *sæpe*, yet it should be rather called *Actus Renovatus*, *Repetitus*, *Iteratus*, then continued. I incline to think there is but one Justification of a person in this life, though there be frequent remissions of sin. Of this you may Consider.

In the Saints *Everlasting Rest*, *pag.* 11. Doubtless the Gospel takes faith for our obedience to All Gospel Precepts. Believing doth not produce subjection to Christ as King, as a finite, but contains it as an Essential part, *&c. Aphor. p.* 25. 5. Faith doth as Really and Immediately Receive Christ as King (as Saviour, or Priest) and so Justifie, *Thes.* 65. Scripture doth not take the word [*Faith*] for any one single Act; nor yet for various Acts of one only faculty; but for a compleat entire motion of the whole soul to Christ its Object, *Thes.* 57. It is the Act of faith which justifies men at Age, and not the Habit.

Against

Againſt this I object; 1. *Faith worketh by Love,* Gal. 5. 16. If one be an eſſential part of the other, and faith a compleat entire motion of the ſoul, then when it is ſaid, Faith worketh by Love, it might be ſaid, it worketh by Faith.

2. Goſpel Precepts are many, if not all, the ſame with the Moral Law; if Juſtified then by obedience to them, are we not juſtified by the works of the Law? You conceive the Juſtification, *Jam.*2. to be by works in a proper ſence, and that before God; and *Rahabs* act was a work of Hoſpitality, *ver.*25. commanded in the Law; and *Abrahams* work was a ſacrificing, or offering a work of the Ceremonial Law, *ver.*21.

3. Repentance is obedience to one Goſpel Precept, yet Faith and Repentance are diſtinguiſhed, *Mar.*1.15. 6,1. *Love, Faith, Hope, are three,* 1 *Cor.*13.13. 1 *Tim.*1.5. 2 *Theſ.*1.3. faith and Love have different Objects, *Col.*1.4. *Phil.*5. 1 *Theſ.* 1.3. Therefore not the ſame; nor one an Eſſential part of the other.

4. Obedience is a ſign to prove faith, *Jam.*2.18. and therefore not an Eſſential part.

5. If Faith include obedience to all Goſpel Precepts as an Eſſential part, then actual faith includes actual obedience to all Goſpel Precepts as an eſſential part; and if the Act of faith Juſtifie men at Age, not the Habit; and receiving Chriſt as King, as immediatly Juſtifie, as believing in Chriſt as Saviour, then a perſon of Age is not Juſtified without actual obedience to all Goſpel Precepts, and this may be not till Death; if then, and ſo, no Juſtification in this Life.

6. If Faith juſtifie as immediatly by receiving Chriſt as King, as by receiving him as Saviour, then it juſtifies by receiving Chriſt as Judge, *Matth.*25.34. as Law-giver, Avenger of his enemies, and ſo a man is juſtified By receiving Chriſts Judging, Puniſhing, Condemning, Commanding, Avenging, as well as ſaving by his Death; which is contrary to *Rom.*3.25. & 5.9.

7. The Scripture makes the object of juſtifying faith Chriſts Death, Reſurrection, Blood, *Rom.*3.25. & 10.9. *Gal.*2.20,21. Nowhere Chriſts dominion. *Ergo.* Subjection to Chriſt as King is not an eſſential part.

8. The object of Faith is nowhere made to be a Goſpel

Precept,

Precept, such as forgiving others, using Sacraments, *&c.* nor Christ as commanding; but the Declaration of the Accomplishments of Christ, and the counsel of God in him, 1 *Cor.*15. 1. *&c. Rom.*1 16,17. *Gal.*3.8. *Ergo* Obedience is not an Essential part.

9. If it be an essential part, then either Genus or Difference; for no other Essential parts belong to a quality or Action: not the Genus, that's Assent. *Aph. p.*254. 274. when the object is a Proposition: when it is an Incomplex term, Trust is the Genus: not the Difference, thats chiefly taken from the object. *Keker. Syst. Logic. l.* 1. *sect.*2. *c.* 2. *can. Defin. Accid.* 5.7. Obedience may make known Faith as a sign, but not as a part, its at least in order of Nature after; the cause is afore the effect: the Antecedent before the Consequent; and faith is such, *Heb.*11.8. *&c.*

10. If Faith be a compleat entire motion of the whole soul to Christ, then it should be Love, Joy, Hope, Understanding, Will, Memory, Fear; But this is not to be said. *Ergo.*

It is alleadged, 1. Faith must be the Act of the whole soul; else part should receive him, part not.

Answ. Faith is expressed by the Metaphor of Receiving, *Joh.*1.12. *Col.*2.6. And he is Received by the Receiving of his Word, *Joh.*12.48. 1 *Thes.*2.13. which is Received by Assent. 2. The whole soul receives Christ, though by other Graces besides faith.

2. *Acts* 8.37. *Rom.*10.10. *Answ.* The term [*Whole*] notes not every inward faculty; but (as after) sincerely, not feignedly, as *Simon Magus.* So *Illyricus.*

3. Faith is called Obeying the Gospel, *Rom.*10.16. 1 *Pet.* 1.22. *&* 4.17. 2 *Thes.*1.8. *Gal.*3.1. *&* 5.7. *Heb.*5.9. But the Gospel commandeth All thus to obey Christ as Lord, forgive others, love his people, bear what sufferings are Imposed, diligently use his Means and Ordinances, confessing, bewailing sins, praying for pardon sincerely and to the end.

*Answ. Heb.*5.9. speaks of obeyng Christ, but doth not call faith obeying Christ: but be it granted, Faith is called obeying of Christ, or the Gospel; doth it follow that it is obedience in doing those named Acts? It may be obedience by Assent to the

the Doctrine of Christ, that he is the *Messiah*, died for sins, *&c.* commanded 1 *Cor.* 15.3. 1 *Joh.* 3. 23. which the terms πίστευω and ὑπακούειν do rather Import, then the other Acts mentioned. The Gospel and Truth are restrained to the Doctrine of Christs coming, dying, *&c*, nowhere applyed, that I know, to the Precepts of forgiving others, suffering death, receiving the Lords Supper, *&c.*

4. The fulfilling the condition of the new Covenant is called faith, *Gal.* 3.12,23,25.

Answer. Neither of these places make faith the fulfilling of the Condition of the New Covenant, nor any place else. In *Gal.* 3.12. Its said, the Law, that is the Covenant of the Law, is not of Faith. *i.e.* doth not assign Life to Faith in Christ. Faith *Gal.* 3, 23, 25. is put, saith *Piscat.* for the time of the Gospel, or Christ, say others, or the Doctrine of Faith. By Faith only the condition of the Covenant concerning Justification in this life is fulfilled, not concerning every Benefit of the new Covenant. Repentance is the condition of Remission of sins; forgiving others, doing good to the Saints, of entering into Life.

5. The Gospel reveals not Christs offices as separate. *Ergo.* They must be so believed.

Answ. The conclusion is granted, but proves not faith to justifie in receiving Christ as King.

6. It offers Christ as King, and so must be received. Answer the same.

7. Scripture nowhere tieth Justification to the receit of him as priest only. *Ar.* The contrary is proved from *Rom.* 3.25. & 5.9.

8. Commonly Christ is called our Lord and Saviour. *Answ.* True; But we are justified by his blood.

9. If we receive him not as a King, then not as an entire Saviour. *Answ.* True; Yet Justification is by his death, 2 *Cor.* 5.21. *Gal.* 2.21. *Rom.* 3 25 and 5 9.

10. Christ is not received truly, if not entirely as King. *Answ.* True; But this proves not that obedience is an essential part of faith; or that subjection to Christ as King, justifies as immediatety, as receiving him as Saviour.

11. The exalting of his proper Kingly office, is a Principal End of Christs dying. *Psal.* 2. *Rom.* 14.9.

Answ. True; But it follows not that either Obedience is an Essential part of faith, or subjection to Christ as King justifieth as immediately as receiving him as Saviour or Priest.

Yours in the Truth *I. T.*

Sir,

ITs to be considered, 1. Whether these words answer to Valedict. orat at *B. pag.* 191. [*Nothing but the satisfaction of Christ, is that which our Divines call the matter of our Justification, or the Righteousness which we must plead to Acquit us in Judgement.*] And it is said *Rom.* 3. 25. through faith in his Blood, and *Rom.* 5. 9. by his Blood, Do not prove Christs Death either the sole or chief Object of faith as Justifying; and how this stands with Aphorism of Justification, *Thes.* 66. and its Explication.

2. Whether the words, *Luk.* 12. 14. import not a disclaiming or denial of a Title to judge, and so your answer be not insufficient, *pag.* 276. which seems to suppose a Title, and only a Suspension of Exercise in that state of Humiliation.

3. Whether if Magistrates be Officers of Christ as King, by Office they be not in his Kingdom, and so Infidel Magistrates in Christs Kingdom, contrary to *Col.* 1. 14.

4. If it be maintained, *That Christ died for every Child of* Adam *conditionally*, It would be well proved from Scripture, that the procuring of such a conditional Law or Covenant, was the End or Effect of Christs death; and whether the so Interpreting Texts that speak of his dying for all, will not serve for Evasions to put by the Arguments drawn from them to prove Christs Satisfaction and Merit, proper to the Elect. For if they may be Interpreted so, *He died to procure the conditional Covenant for every one*, this may be alledged justly; then you can prove no more thence, for that is the sense; and then we cannot prove thence, he died *loco nostro, &c.* It is a matter of much moment, and needs great Circumspection. *Yours.*

Sir

Sir,

BEsides, what hath been formerly suggested to you, these words in your Scripture proofs, *pag.*323. *And where he next saith, that in the aged several dispositions are required to fit a man to receive pardon,(and so justification)*viz *Catholike faith, hope of pardon,fear of punishment,grief for sin,a purpose against sining hereafter, and a purpose of a new life,all which dispose the Receiver; and I agree to him, though all do not*] are so like the Doctrine of the Trent Council. sess.6.c.6. that it will be expected you declare, whether by avowing that speech of Dr. *Ward*, you do not join with the Papists, contrary to Bishop *Downam* of Justification. *l.* 6.c.7.§.1.2. Mr. *Pemble vindic. fidei.*§.2.c.3.

And when you make Justification a continued Act upon condition of obedience, its to be considered how you will avoid *Tompsons* opinion of the Intercision of Justification, upon the committing of a sin that wasts the conscience,refuted by Dr.*Rob. Abbot.* but vented after by *Moutague* in his appeal, and opposed by Dr. *Preston*, and others.

As for Justification by Law-Title, by the Covenant upon actual Believing, without any other act of God, consequent on Faith; if it were so; 1. Then it should be by necessary Resultancy; But Justification is an Act of Will,and no act of Will is by necessary Resultancy.

2. If the Covenant justifie without any other Act of God, then it Adops, Glorifies, Sanctifies, *&c.* without any other Act, which is not to be said. The reason of the Sequel is, because the Covenant of it self doth in the same manner produce the one as well as the other.

3. The Justification of the Covenant is only conditional, therefore not Actual; Actual Justification is not till Faith be put: and then *Posità conditione*, it is Actual: A conditional, is only a possible Justification; its only *in potentia*, till the Condition be in act; Now the Covenant doth only assure it on condition, as a future thing,not therefore as actual, or

4 The Covenant is an Act past, *Tit.*1.2. *Gal.*3.7,8. so not continued; and consequently, the Justification barely by it, without any other Act, must be past long since, and not continued; and then either Justification Actual, and in purpopse; or virtual, will be confounded, or an effect shall be continued, without the cause.

*Jan.*17, 1651. *Yours.*
I. T.

Reverend Sir,

I AM more thankfull to you for these free, candid, rational Animadversions, then I can now express to you: yet being still constrained to dissent from you, by the evidence of Truth, I give you these Reasons of my dissent.

1. First, You think that [*the Scriptures cited, are not to be intepreted of Justification in Title of Law, because this is only an Act of God prescribing or promising a way of Justification; not the sentence it self; and is general, and indeterminate to particular persons, &c.*] To which I answer. 1. That I am past doubt that you build all this on a great mistake about the nature of Gods Law or Covenant, & Promise, & the moral action thereof. For you must know that this Promise of God, 1. is not a bare *Assertio explicans de futuro animum qui nunc est*; (as *Grotius* speaks:) Nor yet that which he calleth *Pollicitatio, cum voluntas seipsam pro futuro tempore determinat, cum signo sufficiente ad judicandam perseverandi necessitatem.* But it is *Perfecta Promissio, ubi ad determinationem talem accedit signum volendi jus proprium alteri conferre, quæ similem habet effectum qualem alienatio Dominii. Est enim aut via ad alienationem rei, aut alienatio particulæ cujusdam nostræ libertatis.* &c. *Vid. ultra Grot. de jure Belli li.*2.*c.*11.§.2.3,4.

2. This Promise or Covenant of God, is also his *Testament*: and who knoweth not that a *Testament* is an *Instrument* of proper *Donation*, and not only a *Prediction*? 3. Moreover this same which in one respect is a Covenant and Promise, and in another a Testament, is also truly part of Gods Law, even the New *constitution* of Christ, the Law-giver and King. But undoubtedly a Law which conferreth Right either absolutely

or conditionally, is the true and proper Instrument of that Effect, and not only [*the presenting or promising a way thereto*] The proper Effect or Product of every Law, is *Debitum aliquod*; *Et de hoc debito determinare* is its proper Act. Now therefore this Promise being part of Christs Law, doth *determine* of and confer on us, the *Debitum*, or *Right* to sentential Justification, having first given us an Interest in Christ, and so to the Benefit of his satisfaction; and this is *Justificatio constitutiva*. You know a Deed of Gift (though but conditional) is a most proper Instrument of conferring the Benefits therein contained. And is not the Promise undoubtedly Gods Deed of Gift? And doth he not thereby make over, as it were under his hand, the Lord Jesus, and all his Benefits to them that will receive him? So that when you say, that [*his Promise to justifie upon condition, is not justifying*] You may see it is otherwise by all the forementioned considerations of the nature of the Promise. You may as well say, a *Testament*, or *deed of Gift conditional, doth not give*, or a *Law doth not confer Right and Title*. And in these Relative benefits, to give Right to the thing, and to give the thing it self, or right in it, is all one: (still allowing the distance of time limited for both in the Instrument) It is all one to give full right to son-ship, and to make one a Son: or at least they are inseparable. Yea, (which weigheth most of all with me) it being the proper work of Gods Laws to *give Dueness* of, or *Right to Benefits*, it cannot be any other way accomplished that is within our Knowledge (I think) For *Decree*, *Purpose*, and so Predestination cannot do it, they being *Determinations de eventu*, and not *de debito*, as such: And the *sentential declaration* presupposeth this *Debitum*, or *true Righteousness*, an therefore doth not give it. No wonder therefore while you deny this Legal, Testamentary, Moral Donation, that you are forced also to deny *Justification constitutive*; (but very inconveniently and unsafely.) By what way doth God give a father Authority over his Children, and a Husband over his Wife, and a Magistrate over the people, and a Minister over the Church or Flock, but only by this Moral, Legal Action? And even so doth he give Power to them that receive him, to

become his Sons. And it is the same Instrument which performeth this, which is called a Promise, Covenant, Testament, Disposition or Law; the name being taken from different respects or accidental considerations.

Again, If the word of Christ do judge us, then that word doth justifie and condemn: (For judging in general containeth these special Actions.) But the word doth judge us, (and shall do at the last day:) therefore the word doth justifie and condemn.

Again: It is a Rule in the Civil Law (as *Ulpian*) that *By the same way as an Obligation is induced or caused, it must be removed or destroyed:* But by the curse of the Law, or the Threatning of Penalty, was our obligation to punishment, and condemnation induced or caused: therefore by the way of Law dissolving that cause, must it be taken off. Now as *Reatus est obligatio ad Pœnam*, so pardon is the dissolving of that *Obligation*, or discharge from it; (*Venia & Pœna sunt adversa*:) And therefore the Law of Christ, or this his Promise or Grant, is the Instrument of Pardoning. And methinks, when you are convinced, that God pardoneth by Law or moral Action, you should easily yield, that in the like way he *justifieth*. For if you be not of the Judgement, that Remission and Justification are all one: yet you must needs yield, that they are of so near a natnre, that the difference is exceeding small, and rather notional and respective, then real. I might to these Arguments add somewhat from the Issue, and different tendency of this my opinion and the contrary. As that this doth give Gods Laws their honor and dignity, by ascribing to them that higher and more noble and effective Action; which the contrary opinion denying it, doth very injuriously debase the Scriptures or Laws of God. Also that this opinion is the only expedient left, (that I can find) to avoid the *Antinomian* fancy of an Eternal Justification, which all they must assert, that say it is an Immanent Act (which you justly and truly deny.) For your way lying in the other extream, 1. Overthroweth all *constitutive Justification*; which is not to be born. (Whether *All Pardon* by the Covenant, I yet know not your mind)

2. And

2. And it Intepreteth all Scriptures (that speak of a Justification in this life) of a strange feigned Justification, which for ought I find hath no ground in Scripture at all; and is wholly aliene to our condition; and at least utterly unknown to us, if not known to be untrue. What doth it concern a sinner to be justified or condemned now before a Court of Angels, where he is not present, nor knows any thing of it? nor do we know what Angels have to do in such a business. And what Transient Act is it that God then and there puts forth or performeth? Can you tell? or doth Scripture tell you? God speaketh not to Angels by voyce. If you think (as the Schoolmen, some) that they see our Justification, as other things in the face of God; then it is no Transient Act. Else why may not they see it in it self? And then either our Justification is Gods Essence, and they see it in him as his Eternal Being, or else God must be mutable, as having something to be seen in him *de novo*, which was not in him from Eternity. If you say that this Transient Act is Gods Illuminating the Angelical understanding to know us to be justified; then this supposeth that we are justified already by some former Act (which can be nothing that I know but the moral Act of his Lawes:) For their knowing us to be justified is not a justifying us, but presupposeth us to be what they know us to be. I can think of nothing else that you can say, except this, that Christ as man may Vocally (or by some equivalent Transient Act) pronounce us Justified, as he will do at Judgement. But 1. this is without Scripture. 2. and it is God that justifieth. 3. And then how were all the faithful justified before Christs Incarnation and Ascension? Or do you think none were justified before?

But I will return to your Exceptions.

You say, [*This is but Virtual Justification*] which is in Law Title. *Answ.* 1. It is *Actual Constitutive Justification*, and not *Virtual* only. 2. But it is indeed but *Virtual sentential* justification. But yet it is of the higheft kind of Virtuality. It is that which makes us *rectos in curia*, (which I take to be the nature of our Justification in this life.) And taken *divisim*, it seemeth more excellent in some respect, then the sentence or declaration it self; for he that by Purchase first, and Pardon (written)

ten) after, maketh Offenders just in Law,) *i.e.* (*non obligatos ad pœnam*,) seemeth to do more for them by that act, then after by pronouncing them just. Though yet this last I know is the most perfect Justification, taken *conjunctim* with the rest, as the end to which they tend, and as that which giveth them their full effect.

Your next Objection is, that this Gospel Justification, [*is general and indeterminate to particular persons*] Answer. It cannot be more certain or effectual. For when it is to all, no man hath reason to think himself excepted (who excludes not himself by non-performance of the conditions.) Every particular man is comprized in All. And for the determination, the *Description* of the person is as certain a way as the *naming* of him. To give Christ and his Righteousnes *to All that will receive him*, is as effectual a determinate Gift to each particular Receiver, as to give him to *Peter*, *Paul*, *John* by name. If a Pardon be proclaimed, or given in the Laws, to all Offenders that perform such a condition; is it not as effectual to each person, as if he were named? If a Father bequeath such Lands or Monies to all his Children (or a man to all the poor in the town) on condition that they come by such a day to such a place, and signifie their acceptance and gratitude: is not this as sure and good, as if they were all named?

Next, You object, [*This is performed, before the person justified believes.*] Answer. I have said enough to you of this already. (of Bapt. *pag.* 100.) I add this much: you must distinguish between the Physical act of making this Law, Promise, Covenant, Grant or Testament: and the Moral Agency of this Law, Grant or Testament once made. The former was before we Believed: but the later was not (properly and fully) till after. Do not all Philosophers and Divines in the world that meddle with it, tell you that this is usual with moral causes, that they may have all their absolute Entity and *vim agendi*, long before they produe their effects? and may be *Actu primo, etsi non secundo effectum producente*, in being long before. The Law that determineth of your right to your Possession, or that doth give a Reward to every man that

that killeth a wild hurtfull beast, or that condemneth every man that murdereth or committeth Felony, &c. was in Being before those persons were born perhaps; And yet it did not *hoc agere*; it did not *Præmiare, Punire, Præcipere, &c.* as to this man before. A pardon from a Prince to a Traytor, on condition, doth not perform the moral act of his discharge, till he perform the condition, though it were in being before. The like I may say of a Testament or Deed of Gift: But what need many words in a case where the Truth is so obvious? If some moral causes may be causes, and *Agere moraliter*, or produce their effects, even before they are naturally in Being, much more may they suspend it, and so produce it long after they are in Being: *Causa enim moralis ea ratio est, ut etiam cum non est actu, sit efficax, modò habeat (ut loquuntur in scholis) esse cognitum: inquit* Rivetus *Disput.* 13. *de satisfact. Christi.* pag. 282.

Next you say, [*Yea it is the same, though none were actually justified.*] Answer. This requires no other answer, then what is given to the former. It is the same *Physice considerata, vel in Entitate naturali:* But the moral action of pardoning and justifying is not the same, nor *is* at all: A *conditional Pardon*, Deed of Gift, Testament, &c. doth not at all *pardon*, or *Give*, till you perform the condition. For it is the proper nature of a *condition* to suspend the act of the Grant: so that till it be absolute or equal to Absolute, it is not *Actual* Remission, Justification, &c.) The reason of all this is, because these Laws, Testaments or Promises, are but the Lawmakers, Testators or Donors Instruments, and therefore act when and how he pleases: and it is his pleasure that they should act no otherwise then as is aforesaid, and as in the Tenor of them he shall express.

Next you add [*To be justified, notes a passion. Which presupposeth an Action transient, not immanent, or only Gods purpose to justifie:*] Answer 1. So far as the Reception of a Relation may be called a Passion, this is true: And no doubt you are in the right, that it is not *Actus immanens*. But now, *What transient Act* it is, I remember very few Divines that once tell us; but only in general say, *It is a Transient Act.*

Now you and I that have adventured to enquire, do happen to be both singular from others, and differing between our selves, (only Mr. *Rutherford*, and some few others I find saying oft, that we are pardoned and justified by the Gospel: by which they seem to mean as I) But for your way of Justification by a sentence before the Angels, as I never met with any that judged that to be our Justification by Faith, so as I have said, it seems to me very groundless and strange. And then, if yours stand not, mine only must, for any thing that is yet discovered, that I have seen; for I know of none that tells us of any third,

Your next Objection is the same before answered, that [*Gods Promise to justifie, is only a declaration what he will do, and therefore a man is not by Covenant without a further Act justified, but justifiable.*] Answer. *Grotius de satisfact.* will tell you, that Promises give right to him to whom they are made; and that therefore they cannot be reclaimed, though threatnings may. But if these were only Promises that God will by another Act do this or that for us, then it were to the purpose that you say: but that you cannot prove. Nor needs there any other Act, but the moral Action of the Instrument it self to change our Relations here: *Et frustra fit per plura, &c.* Indeed an Act of ours [*Believing*] must come in before the effect: but you and I are agreed, that this is but conditional, and not effective. These Promises therefore being also Gods Law, Testament (of Christ) Deed of Gift, Covenant, *&c.* they do not only foretell an Event to come to pass by some other Action; but they do confer a Right or make due the benefit or relation, and so effect it; only the Author is pleased to suspend the effect of his Instrument, till we perform the Condition. As if by a Lease, or Deed of Sale, there be some Office or Dignity made over to you: or some command in Army or Court, or Country: or by a Law a Foraigner be Naturalized or Enfranchized, on such or such a Condition; This Lease or Deed, or Law doth not only foretel, but effect the thing.

You add that [*Justification is a Court-term, importing an Act of God as Judge, whereas his promising is not his Act as Judge,*

Judge, but Rector.] Answer 1. If by a Court-term, you also mean a *Law-term*, (*verbum forense* or *judiciarium* in the full sense) I agree with you. But if you confine it to the sentence as pronounced, I require Proof; as also proof of any such sentence before Judgement, particular or general. A Rector is either *Supremus* or *Subalternus*: A Judge is either *supreme above all Laws*, as being the Law-giver, or *sub lege*. God is both *Rector* and *Judge*, only in the first senses: and by *judging*, he *Ruleth*; and *Rector* is but the *Genus*, whereof *Judex* is a *species*. As *Rector supremus*, God is the *Legislator*, and so acteth (and justifieth by his Laws, Grants, *&c.*) as Judge he sentenceth and absolveth those that were first made just. A man is accused for killing another in fight, at the command of the Soveraign Power. Is it not as fit and proper a saying, to say [*The Law doth justifie this man for so doing against all Accusers*,] as to say, [*The Judge will justifie him?*] Nay, Is it not more ordinary? And in a sort, the Supream or Soveraign may be said to be (though in a different sense) justified, as well as an *Inferior*; when yet the said person in Supremacy hath no Judge, nor is to have any by Law, and so cannot be justified by sentence. God will be *justified* in his sayings, *&c.* as he hath in a sort bound himself by his own Laws, that is, signified his Resolution to observe them; so in the sense of these Laws, his works are now just, and shall be hereafter so be manifested: but not by any sentence of a Superior. But this I confess differeth from our Justification.

Next you say, [*You know not whence it should be that Angels should judge us righteous, and rejoice therein, but by a sentence passed in Heaven.*] Answer. If you think (and prove) that Angels cannot know us to be righteous, then I will not affirm that they judge us so. For I presuppose that that they know us to be so made by some Act before, and therefore they judge us to be as we are. And if they may know that we are Believers, and know that the New Law justifieth all such, then they may judge us to be justified without any sentence in Heaven, even as they know when a sinner is converted, and rejoice in it; which doubtless they may know without a sentence in

Heaven pronouncing us converted; and Gods making them Instruments in conferring his Mercies may make them know.

You say that [*Constitutive Justification, different from Declarative by sentence, I do not find expressed under the term* (Justification:) *it would be considered, Whether any other Act beside the sentence, doth make a man just, but giving of faith.*], *Answer.* These two things I shall prove to convince you: (because this is of some moment.) 1. That some Act there must be to constitute us just, before or besides the sentence. 2. That neither the sentence nor the giving of Faith doth first and properly constitute us Just.

1. If we be not just before we are judged as just, then Gods Judgement should not be according to Truth. But Gods Judgment is according to Truth: therefore we are just before we are so judged. 2. He that hath Christ, and the Benefits of his satisfactory Righteousness given him by the New Law, Covenant, Testament or Grant of Christ, is hereby constituted righteous. But every Believer hath Christ and the said benefits Given him in and by the Law or Covenant: therefore he is thereby made or constituted Righteous.

And here by the way take notice, that the New Law or Covenant hath two Offices; the one to *Bestow Right* to the Benefit: and hereby it *makes Righteous*: The other to *Declare* and *manifest* openly, and to be the *Rule of publique Judgement*: and so it doth both *actione morali proclaim* believers righteous, and *Virtually* sentence them so. And therefore in *Rom.* 10. 5. it is called [*the Righteousness which is of the Law*] And if the Old Law had a power of making Righteous, if man could have performed the condition, so also hath the New.

2. And that the *sentence* doth not *constitute* us Just, needs no proof: It is the work of a *Judge* by *sentence* to *clear* the Guiltless, and not to *make* them Guiltless. Pardon indeed may do somewhat to it: but that is not the action of a Judge as a Judge, but (as you before distinguished) of a *Rector* (in case of transgressing Lawes.) A Judge pronounceth men to be what they first are according to Law; and not *makes* them to be righteous who are not. *He that saith to the wicked, thou art*

Righteous.

Righteous, Nations shall curse him; people shall bhor him: Pro. 24.24. *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord*, Prov. 17.15. If this were not so, then we must believe that no man is justified before the day of (particular or general) Judgement, till you have proved that God sentenceth at a Court of Angels.

And that the *Giving of Faith* doth not make Righteous (that is, according to the Law of works) *effective*, I think you confess. If I thought you did not, it were very easily proved: Faith being but the condition of our universal righteousness (which the old Law requireth in its stead) cannot be that Righteousness it self: and some other efficient there must be of our Justification here.

Next you say [*Notwithstanding Christs Death and the Conditional Covenant afore faith, a person is only justifyable: Conditionalis nihil ponit esse.*] *Answ.* All this is very true: but not any thing against me. I like well what you say of Christs death, because it is (as *Aquinas* and our *Davenant, Usher*, &c. say,) but *Causa universalis, vel Remedium omnibus applicabile.* It is to prepare for and merit, & not *directly* to *effect* our Justification, (whatsoever the *Antinomians* dream:) But the Covenant or Testament is the very efficient Instrumental cause of Justification: and its Action is Gods Action. Yet its true that *Conditionalis nihil ponit in esse*: that is, till the condition be performed: but then it becometh of equal force to an Absolute Gift, and doth *ponere in esse*: even the same Instrument doth it, whose Action till then was (by the Authors will) suspended.

YOu next pass to another Point (about *Thes.* 59.) whether Justification be a continued Act. And you say that [*being a Transient Act, it cannot be well called a continued Act, which imports a successive motion between the* Terminus a quo *and* ad quem, *whereas this Act, whether by sentence or Covenant, is not such a motion*, &c.] *Answ.* 1. All this may be true of a proper natural Action: but you know that it is only a moral Action which I affirm to be continued; and of this you know your Rule *de motu* holds not, except you take *Motus*

largely and improperly. As passive Justification, or the effect of the Justifying Act is but a Relation, which is the weakest of Entities; so doth it *per nudam resultantiam* arise, which is by *the* weakest of Causalities; The Act of God giving out and enacting this Law or Covenant at first, was indeed a proper transient Act, and is ceased: but the moral Action of the Law thus enacted is *continual.* The Law of the land, which condemneth Delinquents, and justifieth the obedient, doth both by a continued moral Act. The Leafe of your House or Lands gives you Title thereto by a continued moral Act. So that this which I assert, is not *Actus repetitus vel renovatus.*

You add that [*You incline to think that there is but one Justification of a Person in this life, though frequent Remission of sin.*] *Answ.* In that you judge as most of the Orthodox do: And I have said nothing to the contrary. I think also, that as Scripture useth the phrase of oft-forgiving, but seldom of oft-justifying, so it is safest to speak as Scripture doth. Yet as to the *thing*, me thinks, that as Remission and Justification do but respectively or very narrowly differ; so in this case, one may as truly be said to be repeated, as the other: that is, As there is an universal Remission of all sin past, upon our first true Believing; which universal Remission is never iterated, but continued: so is there an Universal Justification of the person at the same time, by which he is made just, (and in Law so esteemed, pronounced or judged) by being acquit from the condemning Power of the Law, which (for his sins past only) was before in force against him. And so if you look to such a Remission or Justification as wholly changeth the state of the person, making him Pardoned who was before wholly unpardoned, and fully under guilt of all former sins; or making him justified who was before unjustified, and condemned (in Law;) neither of these I think, are iterated. But then, as you confess a frequently renewed pardon for following sins, so I know no reason, but in the same sence there must be a frequent Justifying: For as our Divines well conclude, that sin cannot be pardoned before it be committed (for then there should be pardon without Guilt; for no man is Guilty of sin to come formally;) so is it as necessary to conclude, that no man is justified

fified from sin before it be committed; that is, from that which is not; and so is not sin: For then Justification should go before and without Legal Accusation and Condemnation: For the Law accuseth and condemneth no man for a sin which is not committed, and so is no sin. It is said *Acts* 13.39. that (by Christ) *we are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the Law of* Moses. Where, as I desire you to observe that phrase of being *justified* by the Law, to shew it is an Act of the Law (though sin maketh transgressors uncapable.) so you see it is a Scripture phrase to say, we are *justified from sin*: And then either there must be some kind of particular Justification from particular sins after faith, of the nature of our renewed particular Pardon; or else what will become of us for them? For sure if the Law be so far in force against the actions of Believers as to make and conclude them Guilty and Obliged to Punishment (as much as in it lyeth) and so to need a frequent *pardon* (for pardon is a discharge from Gūlt, which is an Obligation to punishment;) then it must needs be in force to Judge them worthy condemnation, and so to Accuse (and as much as in it lyes to condemn) them; and so they must need also a particular Justification. But then according to my Judgement, 1. There is a sure Ground laid of both in the Gospel or new Law or Covenant. 2. And the said New Law doth perform it, by the same Power by which it did universally justifie and pardon them at the first. There needeth no addition to the Law. The change is in them: And the Law is said *Moraliter agere quod antea non actum erat*, because of their new Capacity, necessity and Relation. As if your Fathers Testament do give you a thousand pound at his Death, and twenty shillings a week as long as you live after, and so much at your marriage, *&c.* here this Testament giveth you these new sums (after the first) without any change in it: and yet by a new moral Act; for it was not a proper Gift, till the Term expressed, or the condition performed: and if that term had never come, nor the condition been performed, you had never had right to it: so I conceive, Gods Gospel-Grant or Testament doth renew both our Remission and particular Justification. If Satan say, *This man hath deserved death by sin-*

ing

ing since he Believed (as *David*) must we not be justified from that Accusation?

And here let me ask you one Question, which I forgot before about the first Point. Seeing you think (truly) that Pardon is iterated as oft as we sin, by what Transient Act of God is this done? Doth God every moment at a Court of Angels Declare each sinner in the world, remitted of his particular sin? (for every moment we commit them.) If you once see a necessity of judging the New Covenant or Promise Gods *Pardoning Instrument*, I doubt not but you will soon acknowledge as much about *Justification*. And sure a Legal or written Instrument is so proper for this work, that we use to call it [*A Pardon,*] which a Prince writes for the acquitting of an offendor.

Besides, the Gospel daily justifieth by continuing our Justification, as your Lease still giveth you Title to your Land.

(*Mat.* 12.37. is of more then the continuance of Justification, even of Justification at Judgement.)

THe next Point you come to about the Nature and Object of Faith, you are larger upon, through a mistake of my words and meaning. I know not therefore how to Answer your Arguments till I have first told you my sence, and better stated the Question.

Indeed that in *pag.* 11. of Rest, I apprehended my self, so obvious to misconstruction, that I have corrected it in the second Edition (which is now printed.) Yet 1. I spoke not of faith as *Justifying*, but as the condition of Salvation, which contains more then that which is the condition of our first justification. 2. I never termed those *Gospel-Precepts*, which are not in some way proper to the Gospel. And for the next words [*That subjection to Christ is an Essential part of faith.*] I confess I do not only take it for a certain Truth, but also of so great moment, that I am glad you have bent your strength against it, and thereby occasioned me to search more throughly. But then, if you think (as you seem to do) that by [*Subjection*] I mean [*Actual Obedience*] you quite mistake me: for I have fully

fully opened my mind to you about this in my Aphoris. that speak only of the *subjection* of the *Heart*; and not of the *Actual Obedience*, which is the practise of it. I speak but of the *Acceptation* of Christ for our Lord, or the *Consent* thereto, and so giving up our selves to be his Disciples, Servants or Subjects. This I maintain to be an Essential part of justifying Faith, in the strict and proper sense of that word.

Its true that *de jure* Christ is King of Unbelievers, and so of them that acknowledge him not to be their King. But in order of nature, the acknowledging of his Dominion, and consent thereto, and so receiving him to be our King, doth go before our obeying him as our King. As a woman in marriage-Covenant, taketh her Husband, as one whom she must obey add be faithfull to: But that taking or consenting, goes before the said Obedience, as every Covenant before the performance of it. Yea though the same act should be both an acknowledgement of, and consent to the Authority, and also an obeying of it; yet it is *Quatenus* a *consent* and acceptance of that Authority, and not as it is an *obeying* of it, that I speak of it when I ascribe Justification to it: as faith in the *common sense* is certainly an act of Obedience to God: and yet Divines say, it justifies not as it is *Obedience*, but as an *Instrument*. So that by *Heart-subjection to Christ*, I mean that act by which we give up our selves to Christ as his Subjects to be ruled by him; and by which we take him for our Soveraign on his Redemption-title. But when I judge the word *Faith* to be taken yet in a larger sense, comprehending obedience, I never said or thought that so it is the condition of our first Justification, nor will I contend with any that thinks the word is never taken so largely, it being to me a matter of smal moment. Now to your Objections.

---

1. YOu say, [*Faith worketh by Love, &c.*] Answ. 1. Faith is sometime taken strictly for a Belief of Gods word, or an Assent to its Truth. 2. Sometime more largely for the wills embracing also of the objec as an offered good, besides the understandings Assent to the Truth of the

word which offereth it. The former is by the Apostle oft distinguished from Love, and is said to work by Love; as the lively acts of the understanding produce answerable motions in the will. But the later is that faith which justifieth; to wit, The *Receiving of an offered Christ*. And this comprizeth both the Act of the Understanding and Will (as almost all Protestant Divines affirm.) But both these acts together are called *Faith* from the former, which is most strictly so called: because the great difficulty then lay in Believing the Truth of the Gospel, (and would do still, if it were not for the advantages of Credit, Education, Custom, *&c.*) therefore the whole work is thence denominated: though yet the compleating of the work be in the Will, and the Understandings Act but preparatory thereto. 2. You must also distinguish between *Love to Christ the Mediator*, and the *Grace of Charity in general*, as it is extended also to God as Creator, to Saints, to all men, *&c.* And between that first act of Love, which is in our first receiving of Christ, and the love which we afterwards exercise on him: and so I answer you. 1. That as the Apostle distinguisheth between Faith, Hope and Love, so do I. 2. Faith taken strictly for assent to Divine Testimony, produceth love in every one of the forementioned senses (of the word Love:) 3. Justifying faith (comprizing the wills acceptance) produceth both the grace of Charity, as it is exercised on other objects, and also the following acts of it towards Christ the Mediator: And so I acknowledge that Faith worketh by Love, and that Love is not faith. But yet whether Love be not in some sense essential to justifying faith, if you speak only of Love to Christ, and that not as a distinct grace, but as it is comprized in our *Acceptance* of him at first, I shall leave to your consideration, when you have first resolved these things. 1. Whether justifying faith be not an act of the Will as well as the Understanding? Few but Papists deny it, and not all of them. 2. Whether *Christ himself* be not the object of it? Few Protestants will deny it. 3. Whether *Good* be not the *object* of the Will, and so Christ be not willed as Good? None doubts of it. 4. Whether this willing be not the same as Loving, as love is found in the rational appetite?

tion

petite? Sure *Aquinas* saith so, no man that I know contradicting it. 5. Whether you can call *Affiance*, or any other act of the will *justifying faith*, excluding this *willing*, or not principaliy including it? For 1. This is the Wills first act towards it object; and will you say that Love goes before justifying faith, and so before Justification? and such a Love as is distinct from justifying faith as being no part of it? How then is Love the fruit of faith, and as Divines say, a consequent of Justification? Yet it is beyond all doubt, that this *Velle* or *Love* to Christ goes before *Affiance* on him, or any other act of the Will. *vide Aquin.* 1. 2. *Q.* 22. *a.* 3. *Et.* 1. *Q.* 20. *a.* 1. *Et Tolet de anima, l.* 3. *cap.* 9. *Q.* 27, 28 *Et Amef. contra Grevinchov. pag.* 16. 2. And can it be imagined that preceding assent, and subsequent Affiance, in Christ should be conditions of our Justification; and yet the *Velle Christum oblatum*, that *Willing* which we call *Consent*, *Election or Acceptance*, which goeth between assent and Affiance, should be excluded as no part of this condition? 3. Especially considering that Affiance contains divers acts, whereof one is of the Irascible of the sensitive, and so is but an *imperate* act of the Will, and less noble then that elicite Act (which I plead for,) as well as *Posterior* to it: and if *Aquin.* be not out in his Philosophy, when he so oft saith, that *fiducia* is *spes roborata*, then our Divines make Hope to justifie.

Yet for all this, I have not espoused this saying, that *Love to Christ is Essential to justifying faith*: nor will contend with any man that thinks it unmeet: if we agree in the things of moment, I hate to quarrel about words.

Nor do I think it a meet phrase to say, *we are justified by Love*, (though in the sense before mentioned, I think it true,) because it is but a part, or affection as it were of that *reception*, by which we are justified, and stands not in so full a relation to the object received.

And yet, if I had said none of all this, I see not that I need any more then to deny your consequence, as being wholly ungrounded: For it followeth not, that if it be an essential part, that therefore it must have the Denomination of the whole: yea, though the whole be said to work by that part. The Brain and Heart are essential parts of the

Body: and yet not to be called the Body; and it is more proper to say that the body works by the Brain or Heart; or that the vegetative soul doth work by the natural heat and Spirits; then to say, the Body worketh by the Body, or the vegetative soul by it self. I will explain all together in my usual Similitude, which is Dr. *Prestons* (or rather *Pauls*) A condemned Beggar is offered a Pardon, and also to be made a Queen, if she will but take the Prince for her Husband. Now here put your Questions. 1. *Is Love any part of the Condition of her Pardon and Dignity?* Answer, Yes: An essential part; for *Consent* is of the Essence of it: and Love is essential to true consent, to receive any offered good: Not *love* as it is a *Passion*, but as it is an act of the rational Appetite; which is but *Velle*; And *Eligere*, *Consentire*, *Acceptare* are nothing else but a *respective Willing*. 2. But it is not Love as a Vertue in general, or as exercised on any other object, which is this essential part of the Condition: but only love to him whom she marrieth. And so her first love is necessary to her Pardon and Dignity as begun; and her continued love (and marriage-faithfulness) is necessary to them as they are to be continued: (supposing the Prince to know the heart as Christ doth.) *Qu.* 2. *Is it then a meet phrase to say, that she is pardoned and dignified by loving such a Prince?* Answ. It hath some Truth in it, but it is not a fit speech; but rather that it is *by marrying him*, because Love is but a part, or as it were an Affection of that *Marriage Covenant* or *consent*, which indeed doth dignifie her. Love may be without marriage, but not Marriage (cordially) without Love. So in our present case, justifying faith is the very Marriage Consent or Covenant with Christ; It is therfore fitter to say, we are justified by it, then by love; because the former expresseth the full condition: the latter not. *Qu.* 3. *If love be an essential part of the Marriage-consent, then may we not as well say, Marriage causeth Marriage, as to say, Marriage causeth Love.* Answer No: For 1. That Love which it causeth, is the following acts of Love. 2. And the name of Love is most usually given only to the Passion which is in the sensitive; but not usually to the meer *Velle*, the elicite act of the rational appetite. I have

been

been the more prolix on this, because it serves also for answer to other of your Objections, especially the third.

2. You object [*Gospel-Precepts are many, if not all, the same with the moral Law: if justified then by obedience to them, are we not justified by the works of the Law? &c.* Answer. 1. *James* yields the whole. 2. If you speak of our Justification at first, by which, of guilty and lyable to condemnation, we become *recti in curia*, or are acquit, I then yield all that you seek here, *viz.* that we are not justified by works. 3. This objection is grounded on your formentioned mistake of my meaning, as if I thought that justifying faith contained essentially such obedience or works. 4. We are not justified by works of the Law, if you mean the Law of works, or by any works which make the reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt, which are the works that *Paul* speaks of. 5. That which you call the moral Law, *viz.* the bare Precepts of the Decalogue, taken *Divisim*, without the sanction, *viz.* the Promise or the Commination, is not the Law, but one part of the Law: and the other part, *viz.* the sanction adjoined, if diversified, makes it two distinct Laws, though the Duty commanded be the same. The Law that commandeth *Socrates* to drink *Cicutam*, is not the same with that which should command a sick man to drink some for a cure. 6. That our Justification is continued, on condition of our sincere obedience, added to our faith, I mantain with *James*. 7. Will you answer your own objection, and you tell me what to answer: Faith is a duty of the moral Law: if we are justified by faith, then we are justified by a work of the Law. I know you will not evade as those that say, Faith is not a work, but a Passion: nor as those that say, we are justified by it not as a work, but as an Instrument; for I have heard you disclaim that. If you say it is not as a work, but as a condition by the free Law-giver appointed to this end, then you say as I do, both of faith, and secondarily of works. For what Divine denyeth works to be a condition of Salvation, or of the final Justification? or of our present Justification as continued, *vel non amittendi justificationem jam receptam*, as *Conr. Bergius* saith; I know but one other evasion left in the world, which I once thought none would have ad-

ventured on; but lately an acute Disputant (with me) maintains, that faith *is not conditio moralis, vel ex voluntate constituentis*, but *Conditio physica vel ex natura rei*. But I think I shall easily and quickly disprove this opinion.

Rahabs and *Abrahams* works were works of the New Law of Grace, and not of the old Law of works.

In a word, As there is a twofold Law, so there is a twofold Accusation and Justification: when we are accused as breakers of the Law of works, that is, as *sinners* in common sort, and so as lyable to the penalty thereof, then we plead only Christs satisfaction as our Righteousnes, and no work of our own: But when we are Accused of final non-performance of the conditions of the New Law, that is of being *Rejectors of Christ the Mediator*, we are justified by producing our faith and sincere obedience to him. The former *Paul* speaks of; and *James* of the latter. You may see Divines of great Name saying as I in this, as *Mead*, *Deodate* on *James* the 2. but most fully *Placæus* in *Thes. Salmurienf. Thes. de Justific.* &c.

To your third Objection, *That Faith, Repentance, Hope and Love (as before explained) are distinguished*, I easily yield you. But where you say *(Faith and Love have different Objects, therefore one is no essential part of the other)* I answer, That faith in Christ, and Love to the Saints (which your Texts mention) have different Objects, I soon confess. But faith in Christ (as it is the first Act of the Will) and love to Christ, have one and the same Object, beyond all doubt.

Your fourth I wholly yield, if you speak of faith strictly, or as it Justifieth, and not in a large improper sence.

Your fifth is grounded on the forementioned mistake of my meaning. And there needs no further answer, but only to tell you, that though sincere obedience to all Christs Lawes be a part of the condition of our Justification as *continued* and *consummate at Judgement*; yet it follows not that every particular duty must be done, no more then that *Adam* must obey every particular Law before he were actually just. It is sufficient that there be no other defect in our Obedience, but what may stand with sincerity. The same Precept may command, or make Duty to one, and not to another, and so be no Precept

as

as to him. A man that lives but an hour after his conversion, is bound sincerely to obey Christ according to his Law: but he is not bound to build Churches, nor to do the work of twenty years. Christ may be received as King, (and is) in the same moment in which he is received as Justifier; and in that reception we covenant to obey him, and take him for our Lord to the death; but not to obey him on earth when we are dead; for we are then freed from these Lawes, and come under the Lawes of the Glorified.

To your sixth I answer, The Texts alledged have no shew of contradicting the Point you oppose. One saith, *we are justified by his Blood*: But doth it thence follow, *(therefore not by Believing in him or receiving him as King, are we made partakers of it.)* His *Blood* is the Purchasing cause, but we enquire after the condition on our part. The other Text saith, (*through faith in his Blood.*) But 1. it saith not *only* in his Blood. 2. And his blood is the Ground of his *Dominion* as well as of his *Justifying* us: for by his blood he bought all into his own hands: *For to this end he Died, Rose and Revived, that he might be Lord of Dead and Living.* Rom. 14. 9. It may be therefore *through faith in his Blood*, as the chief part of the satisfaction, and yet necessarily also through faith in *himself*, or the Reception of *himself* as the Christ. 3. Yet doth the Apostle most conveniently say, (*through faith in his blood*) rather then (*through faith in his Dominion or Government,*) because when he speaks of Faith, he speaks Relatively: not (as some understand it) by Faith meaning Christ, but using the name of that Act which fitliest and fullest relates to its Object; and so intending the Object more principally then the Act. And as it is fitter to say, that (*we are Justified by Christs blood,*) then that (*we are Justified by his Kingly Power,*) therefore the Apostle rather speaks of *faith in his blood*, as neerliest relating to the Object. Yet, as he excludes not Christs obedience, (for *by his obedience many are made Righteous*) nor *faith in his obedience*, and in his whole humiliation as well as his blood; and in his *Resurrection, and Intercession and Exaltation*; so not in his *Kingly Office.* Look back on the former Example to make this plain. A poor condemned woman is delivered and Dignified by marrying a

Prince

Prince that hath redeemed her on that condition. When she speaks of her *Deliverance*, she will say, [*I am delivered by the Bounty, Goodness or Redemption of my Prince, and so by marrying him that in mercy Redeemed me.*] rather then [*I am delivered by marrying a Prince to Rule me.*] Because in the former she more fitly & fully expresseth more of the cause of her Deliverance: Much less will she think it a fit speech to say, *I am delivered by marrying an Avenger of his enemies, a Condemner, a Punisher*, &c.) as you are pleased to speak in this our case. And yet who doubts, but her marrying or taking him for her Husband hereafter to Rule her, as well as presently to Deliver her, is the very true *Condition* on her part of her Deliverance? Yea, and if you speak not only of her *Deliverance*, but of her Dignity (being enriched, Honoured and made a Queen,) it is the fittest phrase to say (*it was by her marrying a Prince.*) And so if you speak not only of Pardon and Justification (which import our Deliverance *in statum quo prius*,) but also of our Adoption to be sons, and Kings, and Heirs with Christ, it is no unfit phrase to say, *This is by our marrying King Jesus*; or *by receiving Christ as the King by Redemption.*

All the Benefits which we Receive from Christ (which follow Union) such as are Pardon, Justification and Adoption, do flow from our Union with himself which precedes them. This Union is by Faith: We are united to him as to a Head, Husband and Prince, and not only as a Justifier? therefore from him received as a Head, Husband and Prince, do these Benefits of Justification and Adoption flow.

To your seventh Objection I answer, by denying the latter part of your Antecedent [*that Scripture nowhere makes* (Christs Dominion you say, but) *Christum Dominum* (you should say,) *the Object of justifying Faith.*] I never thought that Christs Dominion, nor yet his Redemption was the proper Object of the chiefest act of Justifying Faith. But Christ himself as Lord and as Redeemer is. I prove it, 1. *Christ* is the proper Object of justifying Faith (as I shall anon prove.) But the name *Christ* signifieth as directly and fully his Kingly Office as his Justifying. If you include not his being King, you Receive him not as Christ.

2. To

2. To Receive him as Redeemer is to Receive him as King; For his very Redeeming was a Purchasing them into his own hands, (*Joh.*13.3. *Matth.*28.18. *Joh.*17 2. & 3.35. *Luke* 10. 22. *Ephes.*1.20,21. *Joh.*5.26,27. *Rom.*14.9 *&c.*) though not only so.

3. *Psalm* 2. *Kiss the Son lest he be angry*, &c. Kissing, or submitting to, and Receiving the Son as King (for so the whole Psalm expounds it) is the condition of escaping wrath; therefore of Pardon (for *Pœna & Venia sunt adversa*:) therefore of our Justification.

4. *Matth.* 11. 27. *Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden*, (Guilt is the great load:) But under what Notion will Christ be come to? *Take my yoke and burthen*, &c. *Learn of me*, &c. *and ye shall find rest to your souls.* Rest! from what? from that they were burdened with: and that was Guilt, among other things: and to remove the burden of the Guilt of sin or curse of the Law, is to Pardon and Justifie. (I hope you will not say, that the only Burden that Christ offers here to ease them of, was the Pharises rigorous Interpretation of the Law, as I was told you expound it.)

5. *Luke* 19.27. *These mine enemies that would not I should Reign over them*, &c. If Rejecting Christ as King be the condemning sin according to the tenor of the New Law; then Accepting him as King is part of the condition of Justification. The Consequence is plain, because the said Rejection condemneth, as it is the non-performance of that condition which must be performed to the avoiding of condemnation. More Scriptures might be brought; but the first Argument alone is sufficient, if there were no more.

To your eighth Objection I answer. The Object of justifying Faith is Christ himself principally; and the word as both Revealing, Offering him, Promising, Threatning: but it is not *Christ commanding*, first, but Christ as King *to Command.* This is answered in the former.

To your ninth Objection I answer; when I say that [*Receiving Christ as Lord is one part of Justifying Faith,*] I speak not of the Act morally, as if it had two parts where it is entire: It is but one moral Act to *Accept* of whole Christ (if you speak

simply of Accepting, as distinct from preceding Assent and subsequent Affiance.) But I call it (*part*) in reference to the Object, whence you say ariseth the Difference: Though Christs Office of Mediator be but one; yet from the works of that office we look on his Governing, and Pardoning or Justifying as distinct parts: and thence I call this act of faith (*a part.*) For that you say of obedience following faith and as an effect and sign, I easily yield it.

But where you say, that [*Trust is the Genus where the Object is an incomplex term*] I answer; if you take faith as it is justifying (or the condition of our Justification) and not in the strictest sense, so it hath more Acts then one about the incomplex term. And Affiance is the Genus of one only. To accept (an offered Saviour,) is an Act precedent in order of Nature before any other act of the Will; that is, the elicite Acts are before the Imperate: and Trust is not the Genus of this. Besides, Trust is no one act, but many, and that of both faculties, and a Negation of several acts besides. A certain Argument that it is no one single Act that justifieth, even in their Judgement that say Affiance is the justifying Act; when the Scripture speaks of faith as Affiance, it includes Acceptance or consent, which go before Affiance in order of nature; Yea some of our most Learned, Accurate Divines, when they say Affiance is the justifying faith, do either by Affiance mean only that elicite act of the Will, which I call Acceptance, Consent or Election, or else (rather) they mean several acts, whereof this is one. So *Amesius Medul.* l. 1. cap. 3. §. 13. *Fides ista qua credimus non tantum Deum, aut Deo, sed in Deum, est vera ac propria fiducia: non qua hac voce notatur certa & absoluta persuasio de bono futuro, sed quâ significat* Electionem *& Apprehensionem sufficientis ac idonei medii, ac in quo persuasio & expectatio talis fundatur. Quo sensu dicuntur homines fiduciam habere in sapientia, potentia, Amicis ac opibus suis,* Psal. 78. 22. If therefore you understand by *Affiance* many Acts, of which *velle Christum oblatum*, (called *Acceptation, quia volumus objectum ut oblatum*; and *Election, quia volumus medium hoc, rejectis aliis*; or *Consent, quia volumus ex alterius Promotione qui prius voluit,*) is the first and chief, (of those

of

of the Will)as *Amesius* doth, then I am of your mind. If you say that *Velle vel Accepture* is not *credere vel fidem habere* in the common notation of the word: I answer 1. It includes *Velle* as its principal Act in the common use of the word, when its object is an *Incomplex term:* but indeed it includeth more also. 2. Words of Knowledge in Scripture do imply Affection we say: but *Will* much more. 3. I answer in the words of *Amesius, Medul.* l. 1. c. 3. §. 2, 3 *Credere vulgo significat actum intellectus Assensum testimonio præbentis: sed quoniam consequenter voluntas moveri solet, & extendere se se ad amplectendũ bonum ita probatum, idcirco fides etiam hunc Voluntatis actum designat satis aptè, quomodo hoc in loco necessario intelligitur. Est enim receptio boni sub ratione boni, & intima unio cum eodẽ,* John 1. 12. *Hinc fides fertur in bonum; quod per istam fit nostrum, est actus* Electionis: *est actus* Totius hominis; *quæ actui Intellectus nullo modo conveniunt.* John 6. 35.

Yea further, I doubt not but where this act of the Will is in sincerity, there is Justification certainly consequent: but the term *Affiance* contains some acts which Divines say, do only follow Justification: which also *Amesi.* seems to acknowledge, *ibid.* §. 21. *Quod vero fiducia dicitur fructus fidei, verum est de fiducia prout respicit Deum in futurum, & est spes firma, sed prout respicit Deum in Christo in* præsentia se offerentem, *est ipsa fides.*

Yea the same *Amesius* tells us *Medul. lib* 2. *cap.* 5. That five things concur even to that Belief which we call *fides Divina*; viz 1. *Notitia rei à Deo testatæ.* 2 *affectio pia erga Deum quæ facit ut maxime valeat apud nos ipsius Testimonium.* 3. *Assensus qui præbetur veritati testatæ propter hanc affectionem erga Deum qui est ejus testis.* 4. *Aquiescentia in Deum ad illud quod proponitur consequendum.* 5. *Electio vel apprehensio rei ipsius, quæ in Testimonio nobis exhibetur.* So that even this faith hath many acts. Yea, and he adds, *Primum horum est in intellectu: sed non constituit fidem,* &c. *secundum, quartum & quintum sunt in voluntate, & constituunt fidem, prout est virtus & actus religionis. Tertium* (*viz. assensus*) *est in intellectu, sed prout movetur à voluntate; neque est proprie fidei virtus, sed effectum.* So that this Doctrine which 1. makes three acts of faith in the very

will, 2. and makes the intellectual acts (even assent) to be but an effect of faith, and not the vertue, is far from yours (though I scruple not to take in assent with the rest, for all it is in the Intellect,) and if these be all in that faith which is a holy vertue, much more must that which justifies contain as much. And indeed to place justifying faith only in the intellect, is somewhat strange for those that make it the principal Grace, when Philosophers will not give it the name of a moral Vertue. For in the understanding are only intellectual Habits; but moral vertues are all placed in the Will, or sensitive appetite (for that quarrel I will pass by, whether they be only in the sensitive as *Burgersdicius*, &c.) If any therefore wonder that I place faith in so many acts, and yet make one the chief compleative Act, I have yet further this most accurate Divine saying the very same as I. *Perfectio autem fidei est in* Electione *aut apprehensione illa, qua bonum Propositum fit nostrum. Hinc fidei natura optimè explicatur in Scriptura cum fideles dicuntur adhærere Deo*, Jos. 23.6. Act. 11.23. *& viam veritatis eligere*, Psal. 119 30,31. Where you see also that by Affiance and *Adhæsion*, *Amesius* principally means the very Elicit act of the *Will* as Election is. And indeed he that observeth but how the Scripture throughout doth hang mans salvation or damnation on his Will mainly, (so far as it may be said to depend on our own acts,) rather then on any acts of the understanding (but only as they refer and lead to those of the Will) might well wonder, that justifying saving faith, the great needfull act, should be only intellectual, and not chiefly in or by the Will, as well as all the rest. *Ye will not come to me that ye may have life: How oft would I, and ye would not? These mine enemies that would not I should reign over them*, &c. *Whoever will, let him take or buy freely*, &c. Still almost all is laid on the Will: and yet is not *Faith* in the Will? *Assent* may be compelled by evidence of Truth, and so be unvoluntary. And so a man may be a *Believer* thus against his Will: and if this will serve, men may be saved against their Wills. I know some think it enough that the Will commands the understanding to believe. But even thus saith *Amesius*, *Medul.* l.2. c. they place the first principle in the Will. *Qui fidem collocant in intellectu, necessariam tamen fatentur*

fatentur esse aliquam motionem voluntatis ad assensum illum præbendum : quemadmodum in fide humana voluntarium esse dicitur adhibere fidem alicui; si vero à voluntate pendeat fides, necesse est ut primũ principium fidei sit in voluntate, §. 20 But this is only commanding the performance, & so it is thus no elicit act (for *Aquinas* and others conclude, that *Voluntas est* Principium determinans *actus humanos quoad exercitium actus; intellectus autem quoad actus specificationem.*) But it is moreover the Wills Elicite Act that I assert. And as I said, this *imperium voluntatis* may possibly be wanting, and belief be *involuntary* for the main. Let me add but one more consideration, (for I perceive my tediousness) If *Infidelity* as it is a *Privation of saving faith*, and so is the condemning sin, be in the Will as well as in the Intellect, then faith must be in the Will too: But Infidelity is in both. *Ergo: &c.* That Infidelity which is the Privation of meer assent, is rather said to be willing then in the *Will*; but that which is opposite to justifying faith, is in the Will. *Luk.* 19. 27. *Those mine enemies that would not I should raign over them, bring them hither,* &c. saith *Amesius Medul.* l. 2. cap. 5. §. 48. *Opponuntur ista (Infidelitas &c. fidei, non tantum qua tollunt Assensum illum Intellectus qui est ad fidem necessarius : sed etiam qũa inferunt & includunt privationem illius* Electionis *& apprehensionis fidei quæ est in Voluntate.*

Surely an unwillingness to accept Christ for our Lord and Saviour, is no small part of the condemning sin, which we therefore call the rejecting of Christ; *The treading him under foot; Neglecting so great Salvation; Not willing to come to Christ for life; Making light of him,* when they are invited to the marriage, (*Mat.* 22.) and *making excuses: Not-kissing the son,* (*Psal.* 2.) with many the like, which import the Wills refusal of Christ himself, and not only its unwillingness to believe the Truth of the Promise or Declaration of the Gospel.

To your tenth Objection I answer by denying the consequence; we speak of the soul as rational, and not as sensitive or vegetative. When the understanding & Will receive Christ, the whole soul doth it: that is, every faculty, or the soul by a

full entire motion in its several Actings to the Object pretented, both as true and good. Your Joy, Hope, Fear, are in the sensitive: And *Love* as a Passion, and as commonly taken. And for *Memory*, take it for an act of the Understanding; or of Understanding and Imagination conjunct; or for a third faculty as please your self, it will not breed any difficulty in the case. But whether Fear be properly a Receiving of Christ, or any Object as Good, I much question. I take it rather for the shunning of an evil, then the Reception of Good. So much for your Objections.

I will next, as impartially as I can, consider your Answers to what I laid down for the proof of the Point in Question. But first I must acknowledge, that I have given you and others great advantage against the Doctrine of that Book, by the immethodicalness, and neglect of Art; and not giving the Arguments in form, which I then thought not so necessary as now I perceive it is: (for I was ready to yield wholly to *Gibeeufs* reasons against formal arguing, *Præfat. ante lib. 2. de Libertate.*) The present expectation of death caused me to make that haste, which I now repent: yet, though I see some oversights in the manner of expression, I see no cause to change my mind in the Doctrine of it.

Also I must desire you to remember here, that the proof lyeth on your part, and not on mine: *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* It is acknowledged by almost all, that *fides qua Justificat, Justifying* faith is a Receiving of Christ as Lord, and not only as Saviour or Justifier: And you and I are agreed on it, that Faith justifieth not as an Instrument, but as a Condition: so that they who will go further here, and maintain that yet Faith justifieth only As it Receiveth Christ as Justifier, or as Saviour, and not as King, must prove what they say. If I prove 1. that Faith justifieth as the Condition, on performance whereof the Gift is conferred. 2. And that this Faith which is the Condition, is the Accepting of Christ as Christ, or the Anointed King and Saviour: (both which are yielded me;) I must needs think that I have proved that the Receiving Christ as King, doth as truly Justifie, as the Receiving him as Priest or Justifier: (Yet I had rather not say that either Justifies,

(because

(because 1. it is no Scripture phrase, 2. and seemeth to import an Efficiency.) but rather, that [*we are justified by it,*] which imports here but a conditionality, and is the Scripture phrase.) Till you have proved your exclusion of faith in one respect from the Justifying Office, and your confinement of it to the other, my proof stands good: I give you the entire condition: and *ubi Lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum; multò minus dividendum.* And though those that assert the proper Instrumentality of faith in Justifying, or else the meer natural conditionality, may have something to say for their Division; (though with foul absurdities) Yet what you can say, (who have escaped those conceits) I cannot imagine. Me thinks, if faith Justifie, as the condition of the Grant or Covenant, and this condition be the Receiving of Christ as Lord and Saviour, it should be impossible to exclude the receiving Christ as King, from Justifying, till you first exclude it from the said conditionality. *A Quatenus ad omne valet consequentia.* To Justifie therefore *As* the condition (on which the Promise gives Christ, and with him Justification,) must needs infer that we are justified by all whatsever hath such a conditionality. Yet (as I said before) when we intend to express, not only or principally the Act of the Receiver, but also, or principally, the Grace of the Giver, then it is a fitter phrase to say, we are Justified by faith in his Blood, or by Receiving Christ the Saviour and Justifier: because it fullest and fitliest expresseth that Grace which we intend, (and thus *Paul* oft doth.) So that they who distinguish between *Fides qua Justificat*, and *Fides qua Justificat* and admit that Act into the former, which they exclude from the latter, must prove what they say. (*Fides qua justificat, non Recipit Christum vel ut Regem vel sacerdotem, sed tantum Justificat. i. e. Qua est Conditio, non est Receptio: Nec qua Recipit Justificat; i.e. Qua Receptio non est Conditio: Materia & forma non sunt confundenda. Actus fidei est quasi materia, vel Aptitudo tantum ad officium conditionalitatis: Distinctio igitur ipsa est inepta.*) Now to your Answers: (Pardon this prolixity.)

First I must tell you, that by that phrase [*the whole soul*] I mean the *entire motion of the soul* by Understanding and Willing,

sing to its Object both as True and Good : For I know the whole soul may be said to understand in every Intellectual Action, and to will in every act of willing. But when it only understands or Assents, and not willeth, it doth not Act fully according to its Power, nor according to the nature of its Object, when the Goodness is neglected, and the Truth only apprehended. And it is not a compleat motion, seeing the Acts of the understanding are but introductory or preparatory to those of the Will, where the motion of the Rational soul is compleat. And so my Argument stands thus : If Justifying faith be the Act both of the understanding and the Will, then it is not one single act only : But *&c. Ergo*, &c. *Prob. Anteced.* Justifying faith is the Receiving of Christ : but Christ is Received by the Understanding and Will ; (by the former incompleatly, by the latter compleatly :) therefore Justifying faith is the Acting both of the Understanding and Will. *Probatur Minor.* Christ must be Received as Good, and not only his Word (or himself) as true : therefore he must be Received by the Will as well as the Understanding : for Goodness is the object of the Will.

Here you answer 1. by confessing, that Faith is called a Receiving of Christ : 2. by interpreting that speech [He is Received by the receiving his Word, which is received by Assent.] This is worth a fuller enquiry, because the discovery of the proper Object of Faith, will shew the proper Act. The Intellectual Act [Assent) hath for its *Objectum formale* the Veracity of God, or the Authority of Gods Revealing or Testifying : This is not it that we enquire after. The material Object (for we must use the Schools termes in this distinction, though perhaps fitter might be found,) is 1. *Proximius* ; that is, the moral Verity of the Testimony or Word. 2. *Ulterius*, the Metaphysical Verity of the Things signified (as Christs Person, Godhead, Incarnation, Resurrection, *&c.*) The former is but the means to the latter, and for its sake, and not for its self. In regard of this act of Assent, you may say as you do, that Christ is Received by receiving his Word : because the Belief of the Truth of the Enunciation is the means of our apprehending the truth of the Thing propounded. But then 1. These are yet

two

two distinct Acts, as the Objects are distinct. 2. And this Intellectual Act is called a *Receiving* of the Truth believed but imperfectly, because it leads to that Act of the Will which (in morality) is more fitly and fully called a Receiving: and therefore if Assent produce not that Acceptation or consent of the Will, it cannot fitly it self be called a Receiving of Christ. (For of the Intellects Reception of the Intelligible *Species*, I suppose we neither of us speak.) The material Object of Justifying faith as it is in the Will, is 1. Principal, and Adæquate, which is Christ himself. 2. Subservient or Instrumental, which is the Covenant, Promise, or testamentary Gift, in & by which Christ is offered and Given. These are two distinct Acts, as the Accepting of a Testament, and of the Legacy: of a Pardon written, and the real Pardon thereby signified: or of the Oath of Allegiance, and of the Prince to whom we swear. But because of the Relation between the one and the other, Faith may be called a receiving of Christ, or a receiving of the Gospel. Yet so, as still the proper principal Object is Christ, and the Gospel but mediate, as to him. These are my thoughts. Now (if I am able to understand you) your words import, that in your Judgement, Christ is received two wayes: 1. by Faith, and that is only by Assent: and this is only by receiving his Word: that is, in Believing it to be True. 2. By other Graces; and those I think, you refer to the Wills receiving. Against this opinion I further alledge, 1. Almost all Protestant Divines acknowledge faith to be the Act (or rather Acts) of both faculties, even Dr. *Downame* not excepted (and *Cumero* himself speaks sometime darkly) insomuch that *Melancthon*, *Joan. Crocius* and many more make it the judgement of Protestants in opposition to Popery. And so doth *Amesius* in *Bellarm. Enerv.* though he judge it (as *Cumero*) not accurate, in *Medul. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *sect.* 22. Yea he that though it must be but in one faculty, chooseth to place it only in the Will, and excludes Assent, as being called faith *quia parit fidem*. Excellent *Davenant* saith, *Invitus fidei justificantis Totus Anima se convertit ad causam justificantem*. Determin. Q. 38. pag. 174. And again, *Fides illa quam scriptura justificantem agnoscit, habet in se complicatum actum Voluntatis & Intellectus*. Determin. Q. 37. pag. 166,

Again, *Neq; nobis absurdum sed valde consentaneum videtur, actum illum quo tota anima purificatur & Justificatur, ad Totam animam pertinere: ita ut in nudo intellectu habeat initium; in Voluntate complementum ibidem.* Again, *Quod Philosophantur Voluntatem & Intellectum esse duas potentias reipsa distinctas, dogma philosophicum est, ab omnibus haud receptum; & Theologicis [dogmatibus firmandis aut infirmandis fundamentum minime idoneum*: Idem ibid.

2. Assent is not any full moral Receiving of Christ: But faith (which Justifieth) is a full moral Receiving of Christ, (*Joh* 1.12.) therefore Assent alone is not the faith that justifieth. I know there is a Metonymie in the word *Receive* (because in strict speech in Physicks, *Recipere est pati*) But it is so usual and near, that in morality it is taken for a proper speech; to call the Acceptation of an offered good [*A Receiving.*]

3. There is such a thing as the proper accepting of Christ, required as of flat necessity to Justification and Salvation: But this acceptation is not in Scripture called by the name of any other Grace: therefore it is taken for an Act of faith. The Maj. I hope no Christian will deny. For when Christ is offered to the world as their Saviour, Redeemer, Teacher, King, Husband; who can think that the accepting of him is not required, yea even in the offer? Not a physical Reception which some absurdly and dangerously dream of, but a moral; as when a people take a man for their King or Teacher; or a woman takes a man for her Husband. And for the Minor: Receiving Christ offered is not usually expressed in the term, Hope, Joy, Charity, Repentance; therefore it is included in the word *Faith* (unless you can name some other Grace which it is usually expressed by.)

4. The Grace by which we are united to Christ is Faith: But it is receiving Christ by which we are so united to him; therefore it is faith which is the receiving of Christ. I suppose none will deny that it is Christ himself that we must be united to by believing, and not the Word or Promise; and that it is receiving Christ which unites us to him, is obvious both from the language of Scripture, and the nature of the thing. A People is united to their Prince, as the head of the Repub-

Republique, and a Church to their Teacher, and a woman to her Husband, by the Wills consent or acceptance, and not properly (but only initially, preparatorily, imperfectly and improperly, and if it be alone, not at all) by believing the Truth of their words. *Amesius* saith, *Medul.* l. 1. c. 3. §. 18 *Fides etiam cum sit primus actus vitæ nostræ, qua Deo in Christo vivimus, consistat necesse est in unione cum Deo, quam nullo modo facere potest Assensus adhibitus veritati quæ est de Deo.*

5. By faith it is that we give up our selves to be Christs Disciples, Subjects, Members; (For Scripture ascribes not this to other Graces usually or chiefly. And to take him for our Saviour and Head, and give up our selves as his redeemed and Members, is all one work.) But it is not by Assent only, chiefly or fully at all, that we give up our selves to Christ as Disciples, Members, *&c.* Therefore it is not by Assent properly or fully that we receive Christ. So *Amesius ubi supra*, §. 19. *Crediturus etiam porro cum ex miseriæ sensu, & omnimodæ liberationis, cum in se, tum in aliis defectu, necesse habeat* se dedere Deo *in Christo tanquam Servatori sufficienti & fideli, Deditionem istam facere non potest ullo modo per Assensum Intellectus, sed per Consensum Voluntatis.* And indeed I think this *Dedition* or *self-delivery* to be part of Faith: and that the covenanting in heart with God in Christ, is the very justifying faith, taking him for ours, and giving up our selves to him as his: and the external Covenanting is the profession of Faith: and that Baptism is the marriage-solemnization, and engaging sign and means.

6. That Act which cannot be discerned in a Saint (in it self) from what may be in the wicked, is not the receiving of Christ (fully or properly) which justifies: But the Act of Assent to the Truth of the Gospel, as it is in a Saint, cannot in it self be discerned from what may be in the wicked. Therefore the Act of Assent is not the Receiving of Christ which justifies.

The Major is hence evident: In that justifying faith being the condition of our Justification, must needs be the great Mark to know by, whether we are justified or no: But if it could not be known to be sincere it self, in vain is it made a

Mark to know our ſtate by : yea or a Condition, almoſt ; when a man can never tell when he performeth it. The Minor I have endeavoured to prove in an Additional Chap. to the third part of m, Book of Reſt, to which for brevity, I refer you. Dr. *Stoughton*, I have there ſhewed you, ſaith as I: *Ameſius* ſaith, *Medul.* l. 1. c. ?. §. 4. *quāvis fides præſupponat ſemper notitiā Evangelii, nulla tamen datur in quā quā cognitio ſalutifera, & ab illa quæ in quibuſdam non ſalvandis reperitur, diverſa, niſi conſequenter ad actum iſtū voluntatis, & ab ipſo dependens. Joh.* 7.17. and 8.31.32. 1 *John* 2.3. I doubt not but (in the *Intenſneſs* of *Degree*) there is a difference between the Intellectual acts (as Knowledge and Aſſent) in a Saint and a wicked man: but if any think that they are in themſelves diſcernable, I would he would tell me one Mark of the difference. In their different Effects on the Will, I know they are diſcernable.

7. If you acknowledge that other Graces receive Chriſt as well as Faith, and receiving of Chriſt doth make him ours, and ſo juſtifie; then you muſt acknowledge that other Graces juſtifie as well as faith; (yea not ſecondarily only, but as Principally as Faith :) But that you will be loth to do. The conſequence will not be avoided, but by ſhewing that there is a twofold receiving of Chriſt, and that one juſtifieth, and the other not: which when you have proved from Scripture, I will yield: but then at leaſt I ſhall gain this, that receiving Chriſt juſtifies not properly *ex natura actus, ſed ex voluntate Ordinantis*: and if I get that, I get the main part of the cauſe in controverſie.

8. Affiance is judged by Divines to be an Act of the Will: But Affiance is judged by the ſame Divines to be the juſtifying Act: Therefore they judge that the juſtifying Act (and conſequently the Reception of Chriſt) belongs to the Will.

9. The *Velle* or Elicite act of the Will which I inſiſt on, is the very firſt Act, and goes before Affiance (as it denotes any other Act of the Will:) Therefore either this *Velle* muſt be the juſtifying Faith and Reception of Chriſt, or elſe they muſt ſay, that there is a ſaving reception of Chriſt that goes before the juſtifying faith or Reception: which ſure they will not grant, that make that Faith the *actus primus vitæ ſpiritualis*.

10. Laſtly,

10. Lastly, The opinion seems to me so Improbable, without and against reason, and so dangerous [that God doth assign one only Act of the soul to the Office of justifying, especially the act of assent] that I dare not entertain it without proof It is improbable that in a Moral, Political, Theological Matter, the Holy Ghost should speak, as if it were in the strictest discourse of Physicks. It is improbable that God should speak to man in such a Moral discourse, so as no men use to speak, and therefore so as men could not, without a further explication understand. Doth he that speaks of receiving a man to be our Husband, King, Master, *&c.* mean it of one only Act? (though I know Consent is the chief.) Or he that gives any great matter on Condition of such Receiving, Doth he mean that any one single Act is that Condition? Much less Assent.

Or is there any likelyhood, that when other Acts do receive the same Object, Christ, in a way of as high honouring him, that yet God should confine Justification to one Act, setting by all the rest? Yea when the rest are acknowledged to be part of the Condition? (and Receiving as Lord, to be the *fides qua*?) I know God is not bound to give man a Reason of his Laws: but yet he usually doth it; and we must take heed of asserting that to be Gods Law, which appears unreasonable, till we can prove what we say. Yea what a dangerous loss will Christians then be at, who will hardly ever be able to find out this single Act, what it is, and when they have it? And he that knows how quick Spirits are in their actings; and withall how little able we are to observe and discern them, perhaps many doubt, whether you can find a name for any single act of a soul, or know when it is one Act, and when many. In the forementioned Instance, A woman is condemned for Treason; the Prince writeth to her, that he hath dearly paid her Ransom, & will not only deliver her, but also make her his Queen, if she will Believe this, and Receive him accordingly; If now the Lawyers should dispute the case, what single act it was that she was Delivered and Dignified by, whether an act of the Intellect only, or of the Will only? whether Assent only, or Affiance? Yea whether *agendo vel patiendo* (as many here do.) would not men think that learning made them dote? And I would entreat you to consider, whether it were Gods

Design in the Gospel, to advance any one Act of mans soul above the rest, and so to honour it? or rather to advance the *Lord Jesus* whom faith Receiveth? as Mr. *Gataker* tels *Saltmarsh*, *Many speak dangerously in over-magnifying their own faith, when they should magnifie Christ whom it relates to.* I know the great thing that sticks with some, is that the Scripture oft seems to describe faith by the Act of *Assenting*. But consider, so it doth in other places by *Trusting*, *Resting*, *Taking*, *Receiving*, *Coming*, *Eating* and *Drinking*, (which *Metaphors* must needs signifie acts of the *Will*,) &c. which shew that it is not any single Act. Again, as I said, the *Whole* is denominated from the first leading and most difficult Act: the Language of Scripture is much fitted to the times and temper of the persons to whom it was spoken. Now the Jews did generally and gladly acknowledge that the Messias or Mediator must be *Received, Welcomed, Honoured, Loved, submitted to:* but they could not *Believe that Christ was he*; And this was foolishness to the Gentiles also, as well as a stumbling-block to the Jews; that one that lived and walked among them, and seemed a poor contemptible man, and at last was crucified, should be God and the great Redeemer and Lord of the world. I tremble sometimes to think, if we had lived our selves in those times, how hard it would have been even to us to believe; so that when the great Difficult act is named, the other (Consent and Affiance) are still implyed, and included. I will end with *Amesius* true observation to this purpose, *Medul. l.* 1. *c.* 3. *Quamvis in scripturis aliquando Ascensus veritati quæ est de Deo & Christo*, Joh. 1. 50. *habetur pro vera fide; includitur tamen semper specialis fiducia: atq; adeo omnibus in locis ubi sermo est de salutari fide, vel præsupponitur fiducia in Messiam, & indicatur tantum determinatio, vel applicatio ejus ad personam Christi; vel per Assensum illum designatur, tanquam effectum per suam causam*, Joh. 11. 25, 26, 27. (§. 20.)

The second Argument which you answer, lyeth thus. If Faith be the work of the Heart and the whole Heart, then it is not only in the Understanding, but in the Will also. But the former is the words of Scripture, *Act.* 8. 37. *Rom.* 10. 10. *Ergo*, &c.

Here

Here you answer that [*the whole heart notes not every inward faculty, but (as often) sincerity.*] To which I Reply, 1. The word [*whole*] I yield to *Illyricus* signifies the *sincerity*, which is usually expressed by *Integrity*, but the word [*Heart*] signifies the *subject*; and is commonly taken for the *Will*, and oft for the *whole soul*, *Understanding and Will*, (as most Fathers, Schoolmen and Divines judge in the Point, though the two former placed too much of it in the Assent:) but where and how oft do you find the word [*Heart*] used for the sole Intellect? I pray shew the place. 2. The proverbial speech [*with all the Heart*] is not used in *Rom.* 10. 10. but only the subject barely expressed: *with the Heart man believeth to Righteousness.*

My third Argument (as you place it) was to another use, which is of less moment. As I judge Faith to be taken, 1. sometimes more strictly for meer Assent to a Testimony: (so *James* takes it when he saith, the Devils believe.) 2. And sometimes more fully for Assent and Acceptance, or Consent: (so *Paul* takes it; and so it Justifieth.) So 3. I suppose it is sometime taken most largely and improperly, for the full performance of the conditions of the New Covenant. If any deny this, I have no mind to contend for it, because it is but about a word, and not the thing. Your answer is twofold: 1. *that* Heb. 5. 9. *speaks of obeying Christ, but doth not call faith obeying Christ.* I Reply. That Obedience which containeth the Condition of salvation by Christ (whereof Justification is a part) must needs include Faith: But the word Obedience *Heb.* 5 9. containeth the condition of salvation by Christ; therefore it includes faith. *He is become the Author of Eternal salvation to all them that obey him.*

Your second answer is, [*It may be obedience by Assent, that Christ is the Messiah, died, rose,* &c.] Repl. 1. If Obedience of meer Assent be not made the condition of Eternal salvation in Scripture, then it is not that obedience which is here mentioned: But the former is true: therefore the latter. 2. The first Assent to these Gospel Truths is not in a full proper sence called Obedience to Christ at all: therefore not here to be so understood. As subjection, so obedience is a term of Relation.

on suppoſing the Authority of a Superior, the acknowledgement of that Authority, A command from that Superior, and that the action be therefore done becauſe ſo commanded. Now the firſt Aſſent to, or acknowledgement of the Redeemers Office and Soveraignty, muſt needs in order of Nature precede all obedience to him as a *Soveraign*. I confeſs improperly a man may be ſaid to obey, when he yields to the Reaſon and perſwaſion of another; but this wants the very form of obedience properly ſo called. If it be true that the firſt Acceptance of Chriſt for our Soveraign as Redeemer, by the Wills conſent, may be both the Reception of him for King, and Obedience to him: Yet in order of Nature it is reſpectively a Reception firſt; though in time it is both at once. But the firſt Aſſent to Chriſts Soveraignty cannot be an obeying him as Soveraign. And for the underſtanding the Text, when I find Chriſt give the world, a ſyſteme of Precepts, and tell them that he is become the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him, I dare not without Reaſon reſtrain that obedience (in the ſence of it) to ſome one or two acts: Eſpecially when I find that he hath made the like promiſe on condition of other acts of ours beſides Believing: as in many Text I have ſhewed in thoſe Aphor. *Take my yoke and burden*, &c. *Learn of me to be meek and lowly*, &c. *and I will eaſe you, and ye ſhall find reſt: Forgive and ye ſhall be forgiven. He that confeſſeth and forſaketh his ſin ſhall have mercy*, with multitudes of the like. And *Rom.* 10. that is called *Faith*, ver. 14, 17. which is called *obeying the Goſpel*, ver. 16. And if the Goſpel do as directly and urgently command *Conſent* as *Aſſent*; yea if it command love to Chriſt as of equal neceſſity with both, I have reaſon to think that in this large ſence, Faith includes it. Why ſhould *obeying the Goſpel*, and *obeying the Truth*, be made *Synonima's* with Believing as it is *one* ſingle Act, when the Goſpel commands many other Acts as of æqual neceſſity and excellency? Let me argue thus *ex conceſſis*, from your ſelf and others. Moſt Divines affirm that the proper Reaſon why Faith juſtifieth, is its Relation to Chriſt; becauſe it is a Receiving of him (it juſtifies *Relative i.e.* A Chriſt received Juſtifies:) but Mr. *Tombes* confeſſeth that other Graces receive Chriſt as well as Faith: therefore

fore other Graces justifie as well as Faith. The Consequence is *a Qualenus ad Omne.*

What ὑπακοὴν and πείθεσθαι import in their first signification, is not to our business so much as in what sense they are commonly used: No doubt they may signifie properly our yielding to persuasion, improperly called Obeying: but that they are put for proper Obeying usually in Scripture, most Interpreters affirm. You may therefore as well draw to your purpose the Latin *Obedire*, because it is but *quasi ob-audire*. Indeed the Obedience to a Teacher (as to Christ and his Ministers, and of Scholars to their Master) who useth both Argument and Authority, is fully and fitly expressed in those words. The word [*Gospel*] is principally spoken of the Doctrine of Good tidings or Mercy by Christ (but sure not only of the Historical or Declaratory part, but also, yea principally of the Promise or Offer:) but the whole New Covenant or *Law* of Christ (for so it is, and so the Ancients unanimously call it) containing Precepts and Threatnings also, is called his Testament, Covenant, Gospel, being so denominated from the more excellent part, *Heb.*7.18,19,22. The *Testament of Jesus* is opposed to the *Commandments of the Law*, and called *Better*: therefore it comprizeth Christs Commands, proper to him. And is it not Christs whole Law which is of force when he is dead, and called his *Testament? Heb.*9.17. And when the Apostle saith, *They were made able Ministers of the New Testament*, doth he mean only of the *History*, or the *Precept of faith*, and not of *Love, Hope, Repentance, &c.* Let his preaching witness, as the Expositors, (2 *Cor.*3.6.) Or let Christ in giving them their Commission tell you what that *New Testament* is, *Mat.*28 *Go Disciple all Nations*, &c. *teaching them to observe all things what ever I command.* And not to strive about words, you know that New Law of Christ, which is called his Testament, Covenant, Gospel, *&c.* hath all the Precepts in it which you mention. Is it not Precepts as well as Narrations which *Mark* calls the *Gospel*, *Mar.*1.1.? Was it not the Gospel which Christ and the Apostles preached? And they preached *Repentance and Faith*, and so commanded Duty: If a man loose his Life for publishing or obey-

ing Christs *Precepts*, doth not the Promise belong to him, *Mar.*8.35. and 10 29? Or is that Promise to them only that suffer for t e *Declarative* part only? Is the *Gospel* that must be published among all Nations, the *History* only? *Mar.*13. 10. Was the Precept of *Accepting Christ*, *loving* him in sincerity and obeying him *&c.* no part of that Gospel to which *Paul* was separated? *Rom.*1.1. in which he served *in Spirit*, ver. 9. of which he was not ashamed, *ver.* 16. and which he was *put in trust with*, 1 *Thess* 2.2,4. Was it only the *Declaration* of Christs Death, Resurrection, *&c.* which is the Gospel according to which *mens secrets must be judged*? *Rom.*2.16. or according to which the *Jews are enemies*, *Rom.*11. 28. compared with *Luk.*19.27. Is not it larglyer taken, 2 *Cor.*8. 18? And subjection to the Gospel implies it preceptive, 2 *Cor.* 9. 13. *Peters* withdrawing and separating from the uncircumcision, and fearing the Jews, and dissembling, and *Barnabas* with him, was *A not walking according to the Truth of the Gospel*, *Gal.*2.14. The false Apostles preached another Gospel, and the *Galathians* turned to another *Gospel*, when the former preached; and the later received the Doctrine of the Necessity *of being circumcised*, *and keeping* Moses *Law*, *Gal.* 1 6,7. so that the word [*Testament*] and [*Gospel*] includes Laws or Precepts of Duty.

4. To that of the sense of *Gal.*3.12.23. about the largest extent of the word *Faith*, it being as I said, of so small moment, I intend not to insist on it. My meaning is but this; that some other Graces are intended reductively, and the chief named for all. But by your answer I understand, 1. That you take not faith to be the whole fulfilling of the condition of the New Covenant: which concession shall satisfie me, what ever you think of the sense of the Word, or these Texts. 2. but the rest of your Ans. I am unsatisfied in. You say [*by Faith only the condition of the Covenant concerning Justification in this Life is fulfilled: not concerning every benefit of the New Covenant: Repentance is the condition of Remission of sins: forgiveing others, doing good to the Saints, of entering into Life.*] *Repl.* 1. You know that not *Wotton* and many great Divines of *England* only, but of the most famous Transmarine, do take

Justi-

Justification and *Remission* to be one and the same thing I have received Animadversions from divers learned Divines lately on these Aphorisms, and three or four of them blame me for making any difference between Justification and Remission; though I make as little as may be. And can you think then that Remission and Justification have several conditions? If they are not wholly the same, yet doubtless the difference is exceeding small, and rather notional then real. The same Commination of the Law doth both condemn and oblige to punishment. Remission is a discharge from the Obligation to Punishment; and Justification is a discharge from the condemnation. So much then as that Obligation to Punishment, differs from the Laws condemnation, (which is nothing, or so little as it is not obvious to be discerned,) so much doth Remission differ from Justification. Yea even those Divines that in pleading for the intereft of the active Righteousness to Justification, do to that end make Justification to have two parts; yet one of them, they say, is Remission *of sin*; as the other is the *Imputation of Righteousness*. And I pray how then can these two parts of the same Justification have two divers conditions, so as one is appropriated to one, and excluded from the other? I remember no reformed Divines, but they either make Justification and Remission to be all one; or Remission to be part of Justification, or else to be two Relations (or other effects) immediately and at once (in order of time, if not of nature) resulting or proceeding from the same foundation (materially) or other cause. Though *Gataker* and *Bradshaw* make them to differ, it is but in this narrow (and almost unconceivable way) but in time to concur. I must therfore differ from you in this, that they have divers conditions: and wait for your proof of it. But it seems you will give us leave to say, *A man is not pardoned by faith only*; And yet he is *justified by faith only*! and that as a condition! Faith then it seems can do the whole, but not one half (as some judge) or can do, and not do the same thing (as others.)

2. But do you think that Repentance is not necessarily *Antecedent* to *Justification*, as well as to *Remission*? If you say No; the current of the Gospel-Doctrine will confute you:

which usually putteth Repentance before Faith: and those Divines that say it followeth after it, do yet make them concur in order of time. But if Repentance do necessarily precede Justification, (as I doubt not but you will yield) then let me know to what purpose, or under what notion or respect, if not as a Condition? Can you find any lower place to give it? 3. But if you should mean that Faith and Repentance are the condition of our first Justification and Remission, but afterwards only of our Remission. I Answer, 1. According to your Judgement (who take Justification to be one act transient, once only performed, and neither a continued Act, nor renewed, or repeated,) neither Faith nor Repentance afterwards performed, are any conditions of our Justification in this Life. This may seem a heavy charge, but it is a plain Truth. For that Justification which we receive upon our first believing hath only that first Act of faith for its condition (or as others speak, its Instrumental cause) We are not justified to day by that act of Faith, which we shall perform to Morrow, or a Twelvemonth hence; so that according to your opinion, and all that go that way, it is only one (the first) Act of Faith which justifies; and all the following Acts through our whole life, do no more to our Justification, then the works of the Law do. I would many other Divines that go your way (for it is common as to the dispatching of Justification by one Act) would think of this foul absurdity. (You may add this also to what is said before, against your opinion herein,) Where then is the Old Doctrine of the *just living by faith, as to Justification*? I may bear with these men (or at least, need not wonder,) for not admitting Obedience or other Graces to be conditions of Justification as continued, when they will not admit faith it self. Who speaks more against faith, they or I? When I admit as necessary that first act, and maintain the necessity of repeated acts, to our continued Justification; and they exclude all save one Instantaneous act? 2. And what reason can any man give, why Repentance should be admitted as a condition of our first Justification, and yet be no condition of the continuance of it? or what proof is there from Scripture for this? I shall prove that the continuance of our

Justi-

Justification hath more to its condition then the beginning; (though learned men, I know gain-say it:) but surely less it cannot have.

4. But why do you say only of *Repentance* that [*it is the condition of Remission*] and of *forgiving others*, that [*it is the condition of entring into life?*] Have you not Christs expres words, that *forgiving others* is a condition of our *Remission? if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you; but if you forgive not men*, &c. Nay, is not Reformation and Obedience ordinarily made a condition of *forgiveness?* I refer you to the Texts cited in my *Aphorisms*: *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings*, &c *then if your sins be as crimson*, &c. *He that confesseth and forsaketh his sin, shall have mercy.* And I would have it considered, if Remission and Justification be either the same, or so neer as all Divines make them, whether it be possible, that forgiving others, and Reformation or new Obedience should be a condition of the continuance or renewal of a pardoning Act, and not of Justification? Doubtless, the general Justification must be continued, as well as the general pardon: and a particular Justification I think after particular sins, is needfull as well as particular pardon: or if the name should be thought improper, the thing cannot be denyed. Judicious *Ball* saith as much as I (yet men were not so angry with him,) *Treat.* of *Covenant.* pag. 20.21. [*A disposition to good works is necessary to Justification, being the qualification of an active lively faith. Good works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our* final Absolution, *if God give opportunity: but they are not the cause of, but only a precedent qualification or condition to final forgiveness and Eternal bliss.*] And pag. 21. [*This walking in the light as he is in the light, is that qualification whereby we become immediatly capable of Christs Righteousness, or actual partivipants of his propitiation, which is the sole immediate cause of our Justification, taken for Remission of sins or actual approbation with God.*] And pag. 73. [*Works then, or a purpose to walk with God, justifie as the passive qualification of the subject capable of Justification, or as the qualification of that faith which justifieth.*] So he.

5. How will you ever prove, that our *Entering into Life*, and our *continued remission* or Justification have not the same conditions? that those Graces are excluded from one which belong to the other. Indeed the men that are for Faiths Instrumentality, say somewhat to it; but what you can say, I know not. And for them, if they could prove Faith Instrumental in justifying *eo nomine*, because it receives Christ by whom we are justified; they would also prove it the Instrument of Glorifying, because it Receives Christ by and for whom we are saved and Glorified. And so if the Instrumentality of Faith must exclude obedience from justifying us, it must also exclude it from Glorifying us. And I marvel that they are so loose and easie in admitting obedience into the work of saving, and yet not of continuing or consummating Justification, when the Apostle saith, *By Grace ye are saved, by Faith*, &c; and so excludes obedience from Salvation in the general as much as he any where doth from Justification in particular.

6. But lastly, I take what you grant me in this Section, and profess that I think in effect you grant me the main of the cause that I stand upon. For, as you grant, 1. *That faith is not the whole condition of the Covenant*. 2. *That Repentance also is the condition of Remission* (which is near the same with Justification) 3. *That obedience is the condition of Glorification* (which hath the same conditions with final and continued Justification.) 4. So you seem to yield all this, as to *our full justification at Judgement*. For you purposely limit the conditionality of meer faith to our *Justification in this Life*. But if you yield all that I desire (as you do, if I understand you) as to the last justification at Judgement, then we are not much differing in this business. For I take (as Mr. *Burges* doth, *Lect.* of *Justification* 29.) our compleatest and most perfect Justification to be that at Judgement. Yea, and that it is so eminent and considerable here, that I think all other Justification is so called chiefly as referring to that. And me thinks above all men, you should say so too, who make Justification to lie only *in sententia judicis*, and not *in sententia Legis*; And so all that go your way (as many that I meet with do.) If then we are justified at Gods great Tribunal at Judgement, by obedience as the

the secondary part of the condition of the Covenant (which you seem to yield.) 1. We are agreed in the main. 2. I cannot yet believe that our Justification at that Bar hath one condition, and our Justification in Law (or in this Life, as continued) another. He that dyeth justified, was so justified in the hour of dying, on the same conditions as he must be at Judgement. For 1. There are no conditions to be performed after death. 2. *Sententia Legis & sertentia judicis* do justifie on the same terms. Add to all this what I grant to you, [*that our Justification when first begun here, is by faith (supposing Repentance) before and without the practice of obedience,*] and then see how near we are.

The fifth Argument which you mention, is grounded on the common Maxim, *Non est distinguendum ubi Lex non distinguit*, and runs thus: If the Scripture in propounding to man the adæquate Object of justifying Faith, (Christ) do not divide Christ, and say, [*In believing him to be a Priest, your faith is justifying, but not in believing him to be King, or Prophet, or Head,*] but propoundeth Christ undivided as this Object; then must not we distinguish or divide, but take Christ entirely for the object of justifying Faith. But the Scripture doth not divide or distinguish in this case; therefore we must not. It is Christ that must be Received, and believed in: but a Saviour and not a King, is not Christ. It is Christ as Christ. His very Name signifieth as directly his Kingly office at least, as his Priestly. And if you confess that the same act of Faith at the same instant Receives Christ both as Priest and King, then I shall stay my assent to your opinion till you bring me the Scripture that saith, *it is faith in this notion; and not in that which justifies.* God speaks plainly that *Whosoever believeth shall be justified from all things*, &c. And you confess this *Believing* is the *Receiving Christ for King and Priest*; and that it justifies as a condition; and doth not your (unproved) distinction overthrow this again?

The sixth Argument which you mention, runs thus: If Scripture particularly propound Christ as King, as the Object of justifying Faith, then Christ as King is the object of it: But Scripture doth so: *Ergo, &c.* I have named you some places where it so doth, a little before. The

The seventh is to the same purpose with the fifth. You name two Texts as proving that Scripture tyeth Justification to the Receipt of Christ as Priest only: But there is not a word in the Texts to that end. *Rom*3.25. speaks of Faith in Christs blood, but not a word for excluding Faith in his Obedience, Resurrection, Intercession or Power much less excluding our consent to his full Authority or Office. The word [*Only*] is not in the Text. You may as well say, that it is [*only*] by faith in his *Name*, and so not *in his blood*, because other Texts say, *it is by faith in his Name*. See *Acts* 13.16. The other Text, *Rom.*5.9. speaks neither a word of *Faith*, nor excludes Christs *obedience* (by *which many are made Righteous*) nor *Resurrection* (for *he Rose again for our Justification.*) nor *his Intercession*, (*for who shall condemn us? it is Christ that died, yea* rather *that Rose again, and is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh Intercession for us*, Rom.8 34.) And all these parts of Christs Priestly Office must be excluded, if you will affix the word [*Only*] to the Text, which saith, *we are justified by his blood*. Indeed you make so a quick dispatch in the Controversie about the active and passive Righteousness.

The same answer serves to what you say in the eighth, and ninth, and tenth, being the same with that you say here. I marvail how you would form an Argument from 2 *Cor.*5 21. *Gal.* 2.21 ! Where you say, *Obedience is not an essential part of Faith*, I yield it willingly, taking Faith properly and strictly, and not in the largest improper sense. But that it justifies as immediatly as it Receiveth him as King, as it doth in Receiving him as Priest, I shall take for proved, till you prove the lawfulness here of dividing Christ, and Faith, or distinguishing, and appropriating justifying to one respect, and excluding another in the same act of Believing, and the same Object Christ. And to what is said before, let me yet add this, 1. If Christ be not received as a true compleat Saviour, except he be Received as King, then Faith justifies not as it Receiveth him for Priest only: (for you here confess that he justifies as he is Received as a Saviour.) But the Antecedent is evident: for as King he saveth *his people from sin and Satan*, and all their enemies. *Ergo, &c.*

2. If

2. If Christ as King do justifie us, then he must be Received as King to Justification. But the former is undenyable, *Mat.* 25. *&c. Ergo, &c.* The Consequence is raised on your own Grounds.

The eleventh Argument (as you number) doth suppose several points (very weighty with me, which I undertake to make good) which do overthrow the unsound grounds which the contrary minded go upon. 1. I suppose that Faith justifieth principally *ex Voluntate ordinantis*, and not *ex natura actus*; though it have *Aptitudinem ad officium in ipsa rei natura*. 2. I suppose Christ is first received by Faith, and his Benefits come with him, and in order of nature are after the Receiving of him. These things being supposed, it strongly perswades me, that the entertainment of Christ as King, was never intended by God to be excluded from the conditional Interest in Justification, when I find in Scripture that his own Dominion was an end of his Death, Resurrection and Reviving, and that God doth so insist on this point, to bring the world to subjection to Christ, *Psalm* 2. *&c.* And that the honouring and advancing of God the Father, and the Mediator God-man, is the most Noble excellent use of our faith. Is it then any whit probable that it is Gods meaning to exclude this respect of the act from any conditionality herein? Shall I again tell you the true ground of mens mistake (as I think) in this Point? They look on Faith as if it were a natural Reception, and did make the thing received theirs immediatly and formally, as it is such a Receiving *ex natura rei*, and not as it is *Receptio moralis* whose effect depends wholly on, and its efficacy or Interest is derived directly from the Will, Constitution or Ordination of the Legislator and Donor, and so doth what it doth as a condition in Law-sence. And I pray search, whether in this Question, you do not confound your Notions *ex parte objecti*, and *ex parte Actus*? Let me conclude all by the Illustration of my former similitude. A woman condemned for Treason, is Ransomed by the Prince, who Decreeth, that if she will Believe that he is her Redeemer, and will take him as her Master, Redeemer and Husband, she shall be Delivered and made his Princess; else not. Now the

ueſtion is, what is the condition of this womans deliverance and Dignity? Is the condition of her Deliverance and Pardon, the taking him only under the Notion of a Pardoner or Deliverer? And is the condition of her Dignity, only the Taking him as a Prince who is Rich and Honourable? No: The condition on her part, is the Taking him entirely to all theſe uſes, or in all theſe Reſpects, and more: even the marrying him, and covenanting to be his, as a faithfull ſpouſe and Subject; and firſt acknowledging what he hath done for her freedom and advancement, then to take him for her Husband and Lord, that hath done this to advance and free her. And while ſhe is faithfull to this marriage covenant, in the performance, ſhe ſhall enjoy theſe Benefits: but if ſhe forſake him and chooſe another, as with him ſhe received her Dignity, ſo with him ſhe ſhall loſe them all. So that *ex parte actus* here is no room for your *quatenus* and *diſtinguiſhing*. But now if the Queſtion be intended not *ex parte Actus*, or, what is the condition on her part, but only what is it in him that ſhe receives for her Husband, which doth deliver her? Why then we ſay, it is his Ranſom, his love and free mercy, *&c.* And if the Queſtion be, what is it in him that dignifieth her? Why I ſay, it is his Dignity and Riches of which ſhe participateth; together with the ſame his free mercy as the Impulſive cauſe: And ſo ſhe is Dignified by Receiving or marrying him *quatenus* a Prince, rich and Honourable, and not *quatenus* a Redeemer only: and ſhe is delivered by taking him as a Deliverer or Redeemer, and not as an honourable Prince. The meaning of all this is no more, but that he doth not redeem her as a Prince, nor dignifie her under the notion of a Redeemer: and ſo on his part you may *diſtinguiſh*. But yet as to the conditionality on her part, there is no room for *diſtinguiſhing* at all. For is not this all that *Paul* ayms at in ſpeaking ſo oft of Faith in Relation to Chriſts death and Righteouſneſs, rather then to his Government? to note [*what in Chriſt received doth juſtifie*] rather then [*What reſpect of our act of faith is the condition?*] And may not this tend to an accommodation between us in this Point? eſpecially with thoſe Divines that ſay, Faith is taken Relatively, when we are ſaid to be Juſtified by it; and

it

it is said, to be Imputed to us for Righteousness? The Lord enlighten our dark understandings, and give us love to the Truth and one another.

HAving done with this, I proceed to your Additional Paper, which I lately received, and for which I am also really thankfull to you. But the Answer needs not be long. 1. You think the 66. *Thes.* hardly reconcilable with the words cited out of *pag.* 191. of that of Baptism, *Rom.* 3.25 & 5.9. But I see not the least appearance of a contradiction. Christ whom justifying Faith receives, doth Redeem us by his blood, and not chiefly by his Principality; and he saves us as a Saviour, and ruleth us as a Ruler, *&c.* But that faith which on our part is the condition of our interest in him & his Benefits, is the Believing in, or receiving Christ as Christ, or as he is offered to us in the Gospel (as the Assembly in their Catechism well expres it. *Davenant*, *Culverwell*, *Throgmorton*, Mr. *Norton* of *New England* (*Catech. pag.* 39.) and many more say as I in this: but I will not weary you with citations having been so tedious already. But I am glad to feel you yielding to the Truth, (for it is a weighty Point) as you seem in the next words, where you say, that *Christs Death is the sole or chief object of Faith as Justifying.* If you yield once that it and his Priestly Office is not the *sole* Object, I will never contend with you about their Precedency, *which is chief.* I have confessed to you, that it is a fuller (and ordinarily fitter) phrase, to say, *we are justified by faith in his blood*, then to say, *We are justified by faith in his Government*, because it pointeth out Relatively the causality in the Object, and not only the conditionality in the Act. But I think when you respect the said condition especially, that then it is the fittest speech to say, *We are justified by faith in Christ.*

---

2. YOur next are all of other Subjects. The second is, *whether Luke* 12.24 *import not a denial of Title in Christ to Judge.* The answer is obvious, 1. He had not that deri-

ved Title from men, which was neceſſary to him that ſhould exerciſe the place of a Magiſtrate. 2. Chriſt ſpeaks not of *Soveraignty* (that he had:) but *Magiſtracy* (which is diſtinct from Soveraignty, as being the Executioner of Lawes, which Soveraignty makes, and being under the Law, when the Soveraign *qua talis* is above them.) 3. His Interrogation may perhaps be no *Negation*. 4. But the plain anſwer which I ſtick to is this. Chriſt had not then a Title or Right to the actual exerciſe of his power, as to *divide Inheritances*. The General of an Army to ranſom a Souldier that ſhould dye for Treaſon, doth agree with the King, that he will put himſelf in the place of that common ſouldier for a months time, and will do all his duty, and will venture his life in ſome deſperate ſervice. Now during this time while he is in the ſouldiers place, the General hath not title to the *Actual Rule*, &c. as before he had: not becauſe he hath loſt it; but becauſe it will not ſtand with the ſtate and duty of a ſouldier which he hath voluntarily put himſelf in. Yet at the ſame time, his Lieutenant General and other Officers that have their Commiſſions all from him do Govern. So here: will it follow that becauſe Chriſt had not Title by himſelf to exerciſe the place of a Ruler and Judge, being then in the ſtate of a ſervant, that therefore now he hath not the Soveraignty?

---

3. YOur third is from *Col.* 1.14. I ſuppoſe you mean the thirteenth. But little know I how you would thence argue with any ſeeming ſtrength. Chriſt hath a threefold Kingdom. The firſt (where he moſt fully Ruleth) is *the ſouls of Believers*. It follows not, that a man that is not of this Kingdom, is not of Chriſts Kingdom at all. The Kingdom of God is thus within us. The ſecond is, *The Church Viſible*. This the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of, and of this Heathens are no members. The third is, *The whole world of mankind*, whom he hath bought under his Dominion, and to be at his Diſpoſal (*Rom.* 14.9. *&c.*), who are delivered into his hands, and over-ruled by him, and he is their Rightfull King, and will Judge them as their King, and give them the reward of Rebellious Subjects

jects that would not consent to his actual Rule, (*Luke* 19. 27, *&c.*) and not only as Rebels against God as Creator. If he be not their King, they cannot be judged Rebels against him. Yea the Law of Nature is now his Law, by which he in part Ruleth them though they know him not, (many know not the true God, who yet are partly Ruled by that his Law:) The Jews crucified their King, though they were Infidels, and knew him not to be their King. To conclude this Subject, I desire you but to consider, whether there be any inconvenience appearing in the acknowledgement of Christs General Dominion? and whether it be not the plain and frequent speech of Scripture? And on the other side, whether it may not be of dangerous consequence, as injurious to Christ, to deny so great a part of his Dominion? and excuse not Infidels from the guilt of Rebellion against the Redeemer? And whether it be not introduced by Pious Divines meerly in heat of Disputation, which usually carryeth men into extreams? especially least they should yield to universal Redemption in any kind? and least they should yield to the Magistrates power in Religion.

4. Your last Question is about Universal Redemption [*If it be affirmed that Christ dyed for every child of* Adam *conditionally, it would be well proved from Scripture that the procuring of such a conditional Law or Covenant, was the end or effect of Christs death: And whether the so interpreting Texts that speak of his dying for all, will not serve for evasions to put by the Arguments drawn from them to prove Christs satisfaction and merit proper to the Elect? &c.*] Answer. 1. Though I do not doubt much of the point, yet I have no mind to meddle with the question, as it concerns those *Pagans* that never heard of Christ. Not for fear of any disadvantage thence to the cause, but 1. Because I find God speaks sparingly of those to whom he speaks not: it concerns not us so much to know his Counsel concerning others. 2. Because it is an ill way of arguing to lay the stress of all on the most obscure point; (as men do, that study more how to silence an adversary, then to see the Truth) and to prove *obscuram per obscurius*. 2. This is a point that I cannot give you my thoughts of in a few words; there needs so much for Explication: and therefore

being but here touched, I shall forbear. 3. I doubt not but to prove abundantly from Scripture with much evidence, what I assert in this. 4. It was not the only, nor the first effect of his Death, that Christ was [*Satisfaction to Gods Justice for the Violation of the Law.*] 5. That such a conditional Law or Covenant is granted, and exstant in Scripture, is as plain as most points in the Gospel: and sure no such thing can be but upon Christs death as the meritorious cause. 6. So interpreting these Texts which are so to be interpreted, is no evasion: And no Text will prove Christs satisfaction and Merit wholly proper to the Elect. Much less those which say, *He died for all men*, That God intendeth only the Elect to be certainly saved by Christs death, I can easily prove from many other Texts: But if I should prove it by these, it were strange. It is an ill consequence [*Christ died for all men; therefore his satisfaction is proper to the Elect.*] 7. In point of Law the Elect have no more Title to Christ and his Benefits, then any others (as Elect before they believe.) But Gods *Decree* hath from Eternity appropriated Salvation by Christ only to the Elect in point of Event. He that determined *de eventu*, that only the Elect should be saved by Christ, did yet think it the fittest way to his glorious ends to make Christs Death a *sufficient satisfaction for all*, & to make in his new Law a free deed of Gift of Christ, and all his Benefits to all that will receive him as he is offered: yet not engaging himself to publish this Law to every particular man; though it be of universal extent in the Tenor. The Promise names none as included; nor excludeth any, but who do wilfully exclude themselves. But these things require fuller opening.

8. Lastly, [*Christ dying loco nostro*] as you say, is a term that needs as great caution for the true understanding it, as most that we make use of. The right understanding of it, is the main Ground of our safety and comfort: The wrong understanding it, is the very turning point to Antinomianism, and the very *Primum vivens & ultimum moriens*, the Heart of the whole System of their Doctrine. That Christ in the person of Mediator, did suffer upon his voluntary undertaking what we should have else suffered, and thereby made satisfaction

on to Gods Justice for the breach of his Law, both Father and Son (whose Will is one) agreeing or resolving, that yet no man should have actual Remission or Salvation hereby, but on condition of receiving the Redeemer for their Lord and Saviour : and thus Christ died *loco omnium* : this is sound Doctrine. That at the same time it was the secret Will or Eternal Decree of the Father ; and the Will of the Mediator *de eventu*, to give effectually Grace to believe to his Chosen only ; and consequently that they only should be actually saved, and thus he died only *loco Electorum*, is also sound Doctrine. But that Christ in dying did strictly represent the person of the sinner, so as either naturally, or morally in Law-sense we may be said to have satisfied then, in or by him, as the Law calls that the action of the Principal, which is done *per Delegatum, Deputatum, Vicarium, &c.* this is the soul of Antinomianism, and directly and unavoidably introduceth Justificat^n. before Faith, or before we are born ; the non-necessity of any other Justification, but *in foro conscientiæ* ; it certainly overthrowrth all pardon of sin at all ; and so all Petition for Pardon, and all thanksgiving for it, with the rest of their errors: yea makes man his own Redeemer. But I have been too long already. I sensibly acknowledge the truth of what you say That this is a matter of great moment, and needs great consideration. I have bestowed more consideration about it, then about any other point in Divinity.

YOUR *unfeigned Friend and Brother (who doubts not ere long to meet you in our Center and Rest, where all our Difference in Judgement and Affection will be healed.)*

RICHARD BAXTER.

Kederminster, *June 9.*
1651.

Sir, *The multitude of my Enployments caused me to delay the returning you my thoughts of your favourable Animadversions, til I received your Additional paper, which made me so very sensible of your Kindness, that I could not but snatch the next opportunity, thus truly to give you my further Thoughts, as an account of the acceptance and success of your Pains.*

June 20.

Sir,

YEsterday I received your third Paper dated *June* 17. to which I thought best to give you this short Answer together, seeing the former were not gone out of my hands.

You here touch (very easily) on two Subjects. I will begin with the later, *viz.* Your four Arguments against my Doctrine of Justification by the Gospel Grant or New Law. Your first is, that *This is per resultantiam; but Justification is an act of Will; but no Act of Will is by necessary Resultancy*] Answer. As it proceedeth from the *Instrument* or *Foundation*, it is by *Resultancy*: As by that Instrument it is the Act of the *Legislator* or *Principal Agent*, so it is an Act of Will. It

was

was his Will at the enacting of the *Grant*, and ſtill is his *Will*, that this his *Grant*, or *Deed of Gift* ſhould *moraliter agere & effectus hos vel illos producere*, at ſuch a diſtance upon ſuch and ſuch conditions. The Act and Effect of the Law, or Teſtament, is the Act and Effect of the Legiſlator and Teſtator, whoſe Inſtrument it is: But the ſaid Law or Teſtament doth not *efficaciter agere*, or produce theſe effects, till the time that the conditions are performed: (for it is the Nature of a Moral condition to be added for the ſuſpenſion of the Effect or event of the Grant, *&c.* till it be performed.) Therefore the Rector, Donor or Teſtator doth not *efficaciter agere* till then. And therefore he acteth by that his Inſtrument then, or not at all. If you give by Deed or by Will, ſuch and ſuch portions to ſome Children at ſuch a term of Age, and to others when they marry; The full actual Right is by a meer Reſultancy, as from the *Inſtrument*. but by an Act of *Will*, as from you, but really from neither before the Term, or condition performed. This is a moſt obvious Truth.

2. And as eaſie is the Anſwer to your ſecond. [*If the Covenant juſtifie without any other Act, then it adopts, ſanctifieth, Glorifieth, without any other.*] Anſwer. In the Propoſitions againſt Mr. *Bedford*, you might have ſeen this diſpelled. For *Adoption*, I yield the whole. But know you not that as there is great difference between changes Relative and Qualitative; ſo the later reſults not from a meer *Fundamentum, &c.* but is effected by a Phyſical Operation? It is *Jus ad rem*, it is *Right* or *Duneſs*, which is the proper immediate product, or (*quaſi*) effect reſulting from, and given by the Law, or the like Inſtrument; and not the natural thing it ſelf. Now in theſe Relations, either the *Right* and the thing *it ſelf* are the ſame; or elſe the difference ſo ſmall, that it is next to undiſcernable, and muſt needs both *in eodem inſtanti* reſult, as afore ſaid. But in Phyſical changes, there is a greater difference between the Right and the Benefit: The *Benefit* cannot, as the *Right* doth, proceed *per nudam reſultantiam*. If you give your Son 100. l. by a Deed of Gift, this giveth him the Right immediately, but not the Thing. There muſt be a Phyſical Act to that. But Pardon to a Malefactor is

given by a written *Pardon* or *Grant*, from whence the Right to it, and the Benefit it self, do immediately result (being indeed but one thing, except my understanding be too gross to distinguish them.) If therefore you had said as you should, that *Right* to Glory, and to Sanctity (so far as that Covenant giveth it) are bestowed without any other Act, (except final Judgement, which is necessary to full Justification as well as Glory) I should yield you all.

3. To your third, [*That the Covenant justifies but conditionally, therefore not actually.*] I answered before: for it was one of your former Arguments. *Conditio est Lex addita negotio quæ donec præstetur eventum suspendit*, saith *Cujacius*. And as *Mynsinger* saith, *Neq; actio, neq; obligatio ulla est antequam conditio eveniat: quia quod est in conditione, non est in obligatione*: (*Schol. in Instit.* p. 523.) So that it is the Nature of the condition to suspend the effect, but not to make the cause to be no cause. Indeed if the Condition be never performed, then it destroyes or prevents the effect, and so the Instrument doth not *agere*: And why? but because it was the Will of the Agent that it should act so, and on such terms, or else not: so that the non-performance doth not undo what the Instrument did, nor doth it disoblige the Author, but it manifesteth that he was never obliged: (they are *Grotius* words.) I conclude therefore that when the condition is performed, then the Instrument or conditional Grant doth begin *verè agere & donare*; and the Agent by it: but till then it doth not properly act or effect at all. Is not your Testament that gives your Legacy, because it gives conditionally? Or must there be some other Act, to make it an absolute proper Gift.

4. Your fourth also is one of those which you have in the Beginning, where I have answered it. *The Covenant* you say, *is an Act past; and so not continued, and so the Justification by it past, and not continued, &c.*] Answer. The *Physical* Act of Legislation or Covenant-granting is past: but this only makes it an *Instrument*, able and fit to produce such and such effects, and not actually to produce them at that present, when it is conditional. But the Moral action of this Law or Covenant is not past, but continued. The Law or Covenant is not

out

ont of Date. And therefore it continueth still to justifie. The making of our Laws, are Acts past by Parliaments long ago, and so not continued. Will you therefore conclude that the Moral Agency or Efficiency of these Laws is past, and therefore they do not condemn or justifie? I know no ground that can bear your conclusions, except with *Rishworth (Dialog)* and such other of the more impudent Papists, one should vilifie the Scripture, and say, that they were only Miscellaneous occasional writings, and never intended to be *Gods Law*, or our *Rule of Faith and Life*: but I believe you will never come to that. Surely *David* frequently stileth the old Scriptures that were in his Times *Gods Law*: And why many Divines should strike in with some *Lutherans* Error in denying the Gospel or New Scripture to be properly [*Christs Law*,] and so inveigh against those that call it the *New Law*, I know no Reason: but that the *ignis fatuus* of contention and prejudice misleadeth them. O happy Disputers that are not carried head-long into extreams by the spirit of Contradiction! What more proper to the reformed Religion, as such, then to honour the Scriptures? And how do these men vilifie them, and rob them of their higheft honor, that deny them to be the Laws of God? yea deny this to the Gospel it self? Is not Christ the Law-giver? *Isa.* 33. 22. *Psal.* 60. 7. and 108. 8. and the King? Must not the Law go out of *Zion*, *Isa.* 2. 3. And is not that the Law and Testimony to which we must seek? Multitudes of Scriptures, and most of the Fathers (that ever I read) do call the Gospel Christs Law or the [new law.]

2. To your second Exception, [against my approving a speech of Dr. *W.*] I ans. 1. Do I need to tell you how unlike this saying of Dr. *Wards* is to that of the Council of *Trent*? You know by *Justification* they mean principally Sanctification? But the Dr. saith not that these are preparatives to Justification. Sure you could not seriously suspect me to join with the Papists when they speak of one Subject, and I of another. The acts of that Session will tel you more differences between them and me, then is worth the while to repeat: and you know how largely *Chemnitius* endeavours to prove that by *Dispositions and Preparations*, The Councill mean *Merits*; and that

they would subdolously introduce the Thing, (*Merita de congruo*) by changing the name; as out of *Osius* words and others he gathers. 2. And know you not that *Chemnitius* professeth to yield to the soundness of that very sixth Chapter, which you alledge, were it not for these guiles that they use, and their evil sense to advance Merit? For saith he, *Omnino certus est sive modus sive ordo in verbo Dei nobis designatus & præscriptus, quo Deus utitur quando vult hominem ad Justificationem deducere*, &c. *Et qui ad modum sive ordinem illum divinitus præscriptum, non volunt se ductu spiritus accommodare, sed negligunt & conculcant illum, hi ad Justificationem non proveniunt. Vult enim Deus à Notitia & Assensu verbi sui nos ordiri: & ante Justificationem oportet præcedere contritionem, hoc est, seriam agnitionem peccatorum, pavores conscientiæ agnoscentis iram Dei adversus nostra peccata, & dolentis propter peccatum: in qua contritione non retinetur, sed abjicitur propositum perseverandi & pergendi in sceleribus. Ad hos vero terrores necesse est accedere fidem, quæ agnitione & fiducia misericordiæ Dei promissæ propter filium mediatorem, rursus erigat & consoletur animum, ne oppressi desperatione ruamus in æternum exitium. Sed fides accedat ad Deum, quærat, desideret, petat, apprehendat & accipiat Remissionem peccatorum. Et hoc modo seu ordine in verbo Dei designato viam parari Domino, ut in ipso, per & propter ipsum fide consequamur & accipiamus Justificationem, ipsa scriptura tradit, &c.* this also he shews *Luther* approved of.

Now I pray you tell me whether here be not full as much as Dr. *Ward* or I say? And do you think *Chemnitius* did join with the Papists of *Trent*, when he confuted them?

3. And if Dr. *W.* had spoak of Sanctification, are there not multitudes of our own best approved Divines, that make all these acts to be found in men by way of preparation before Sanctification? Mr. *Rogers* of *Dedham* in his Treat. of faith: Mr. *Hooker* in his Epist. before that book, and oft in his own book, affirmeth not only a common preparatory contrition, Hungring and thirsting, Hope Love, Joy, but even effectual special Vocation it self, and so faith to go before Sanctification and Justification. And indeed what man denyeth it? except

Mr.

Mr. *Pemble* and a very few that with him make Sanctification and Vocation to be all one? which how far I approve my self, I have shewed in Treat. of Rest, Part. 1 Chap. 8. sect. 2. 3. 4.

4. But look into the words, and find out what error you can! Which of those acts do you think goes not before Justification? And if they go before, sure you will not deny but they do some way or other dispose or fit a man for pardon: or else God would not have prescribed them before it. 1. Catholick faith is the Belief of the Catholick Doctrine. I am sure you take that to go before Justification. 2. If Hope of pardon go not before, then Affiance (to which Hope is essential) goes not before: Yea, then Believers do despair in the Act of Believing to Justification. 3. I never knew the man that doubted whether fear of Punishment went before. 4. The same I may say of grief for sin. 5. And if all the doubt be of *Purpose against sin, and for Amendment*, 1. Sure they that say *Repentance* is pre-requisite to justification, will not exclude a *Purpose of Amendment*. 2. And sure those that say Sanctification and Vocation are all one, and go before Justification will hardly exclude it. 3. They that take a turning from Idols to the true God, as the end, to be in order before a Turning from Infidelity to the Mediator as the way, which is by Faith; these must needs think that so much of *Actual* Amendment goes before Justifica ion (*ye believe in God, believe also in me.*) 4. They that say, *Faith alone justifieth, but not the faith which is alone*, will surely include this *Purpose* as Antecedent. *Davenant*, Mr. *Ball* &c. express it, and insist on it. Dr. *Twisi* calleth works *Media & causæ dispositivæ*: But it were endless to cite Authors in this Point. 5. But I tell you my mind. I take this Purpose of obeying Christ *de futuro* to be very Faith it self. For faith is a Covenant-reception of Christ, and to take him for Christ and King-Redeemer, and to Purpose, yea Covenant to obey him, are but one thing. And therefore a Giving up our selves as Redeemed-subjects, and so a purpose of being actually subject, are faith it self. And then they must needs be prerequisite to Justification. So that whether you take these Acts for common or special, surely they go before Justification

as Dr. *Ward* saith. Dare you tell any man of your Hearers that though he have not so much as a Purpose to mend, yet he is justified by Faith? Truly such passages haue embittered the minds of Papists, and many weak ones against our Doctrine of Justification: and given great advantage to the *Antinomists*.

For what you say of contradicting Dr. *Downame* and Mr. *Pemble*; I answer, 1. Though they differ between themselves in the point of Justification, and one hath wrote a confutation of the others Doctrine, yet you will never shew me wherein this speech of Dr. *Ward* doth contradict either of them. Indeed if Dr. *Ward* had determined whether he meant common Dispositions or special, perhaps he might have contradicted one of them, they do so far differ themselves. For you know Mr. *Pemble* not only in his *Vindic. Grat.* but even in the place you cite (*pag.*42.43.) takes those Acts to be of special Grace, or a part of Sanctification, which most Divines do judge to be preparatory thereto. And for my part, I judge as Mr. *Pemble*, if you take but that point in to qualifie it, which I have asserted *Treat. of Rest*, second *Edit. part* 3. *cap.*11. that the sincerity of Grace as saving, lyeth not in the bare nature of the Act, but in the prevailing degree which Morality may specifie, then I say as Mr. *Pemble*, pag.43. that these Vertues which are (many of them by our Divines) reckoned as Dispositions to Regeneration, are if they be true, the main parts and fruits of Regeneration.

2. But I admire how you should think that speech of Dr. *Wards* should be a joining with the Papists against Dr. *Downame* and Mr. *Pemble*, when *Downame* tells you that the Papists dispute of another subject then we do; while they mean one thing by it, *viz.* Sanctification, and we another: (upon which ground Mr. *Wotton* is ready to throw out the Dispute, as being about one Term, but different subjects.) And Mr. *Pemble* answers [*that the Argument of* Bellarmine *from that chapter of the Councils sixth sess. is framed on the Error which puts out of frame the whole Dispute*, viz. *that Regeneration and Sanctification is all one thing with Justification, and that to justifie a sinner is nothing else but to do away inherent corruption*

tion by infusion of inherent Righteousnes.] And so Mr. *Pemble* disputes against it only as thus meant: And *Calvin* also in his *Antidot.* on this 6. *Sess.* 6. *chap*, never once finds fault with them here, but only for ascribing that to free Will which they should ascribe to effectual Grace; and for making Justification to be Sanctification, but not a word for making these Acts to be præparatory to Justification, (*Tractat. Theologic. pag.*387 388.) *Vid. etiam Articulos facultat. Parisiens. Art.* 4. *de sensu Papistico.* Every man that makes Faith to contain many acts (most Divines say, *Notitiam, Assensum & fiduciam, Amesius* names five,) must needs make all those Acts to be pre-requisite to Justification, besides Repentance, and besides preparatory acts of common Grace. No man that I know doth seem to come nearer you then Dr. *Downame* in placing justifying faith in Assent, and so not taking it to contain so many acts: And yet even he tells you, that [*the act of the Will doth concur to Faith, and that faith which is a habit of the mind, is seated as well in the Will as in the Understanding: and this is confessed by Fathers, Schoolmen, and the modern Doctors of the Romish Church.*] *Treat. of Justif.* pag. 358. 359. Yea for ought I can understand he extended faith as far as I, and meant as I do herein, *pag.* 348. 349. 352. he saith, [*By the former which is a bare Assent, we do after a sort* Credere Christum, *acknowledge him to be the Saviour of those that believe in him: By the latter, which is the lively and effectual Assent working on the Heart, we do* credere in Christum, *and receive him to be our Saviour, whereupon necessarily followeth Affiance in Christ, and love of him as a Saviour. Thus then by a true Belief we receive and Embrace Christ, in our judgement by a lively Assent: in our* Hearts, *desiring earnestly to be partakers of him (which Desire we express by our Prayer,) and in our Wills resolving to* acknowledge and Profess *him to be our only Saviour, and to rest upon him alone for Salvation. So that a true lively and effectual faith is the Work of the whole soul: that is to say, as well of the Heart as of the Mind,* Rom 10.10 Act. 16.14. Act. 8.37.] so far Dr. *Downame.* Is not this as much as I say? and the very same? I only mention him (having many more at hand) because 1. you urge him, and 2. I conjecture, you think you

go

go his way about the nature of Faith. If this be not as much as I say, do but add what he saith, *pag.* 15. and I think you have as much: (in this particular.) [*The true meaning* (saith he) *of the Question*, [*whether we are just fied by Faith or by Works?*] *is not as opposing the inward Grace of Faith to the outward acts of Obedience, which indeed are the fruits of Faith: But as opposing the Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, to the righteousness which is Inherent in our selves, and performed by our selves.*

And truly Sir, I use to charge my conscience to enquire what may be the plain meaning of a Text, and to embrace that, and not against Light to be carryed by prejudice: and this conscience tells me that this Resolution of Dr. *Downame* being so plainly agreeable to *Paul*, is not to be rejected. When I impartially consider what *Paul* driveth at, my Judgement tells me that it was never his intent to advance any one simple Act of the soul into the office of justifying, excluding all the rest; but to advance Christ against mens own works which stood up then in competition with him: And that *Paul* never meant that Assent Justifies, but not *Velle; Acceptare, Consentire, Eligere, Fiduciam habere*, &c.

Suppose there be a mortal Disease that hath seized on a City, which no man can cure but one only Physitian: nor he but by a Medicine that will cost him as much as the lives of the Citizens are worth: This Physitian comes and sends to them, and offers them all without exception, that if they will but take him for their Physitian and trust him with their lives, he will not only manifest his skill, that he is able to cure them, but he will do it, and pay for the Physick, and not put them to pay a penny. Hereupon some that are his enemies, and some that are mistaken in the man upon false reports, and some that judge of him by his outward appearance, do all conclude, [this is some Deceiver he is not able to do any such matter; none but fools will trust him, and venture their lives in his hand: Let us stir about and labour and we shall overcome it, and do well enough.] On the contrary the Physitian, having great compassion on the poor deluded people, knowing their case better then themselves, and having already bought the remedy for them

them, doth send to them again, to tell them all, that those that will believe him and trust him, he will certainly cure, and the rest shall dye every man of them, for all they think to labour it away. I pray you now put our Questions here impartially: 1. Is believing and trusting the Physitian some one single act, excluding all others? Or was it ever his intent to advance some one act of theirs? 2. Would it not be a learned madness to dispute whether the Physitian make the act of Assent, or the act of Willing only: or Accepting, *&c.* or Affiance, or Recumbency to be the Healing act; and of what faculty that act was which must heal them? 3. Is it the Trusting and Receiving him only 1. as one that hath brought a Remedy: 2. Or as one that can and will cure us by it: or 3. Also as one that must be obeyed in the use of that remedy for the effecting the cure; which of these is it that he intends must be the Object of their Act? 4. Doth [Trusting him and Believing him] exclude a Resolution to obey his Directions and the future actual obedience? Surely no: it includeth both: But it excludeth both their trusting any other Physitian, and their thinking to work away the Disease and cure themselves. 5 Doth Trusting or Believing him cure these men as the Instrument? or is it only a condition without which he will not cure them? But this Question with you I may spare.

Lastly, You question, [*How I will avoid* Tompsons *opinion of the Intercision of Justification upon the committing a sin that wasts the conscience, when I make Justification a continued Act upon condition of obedience.?*] *Answ.* 1. Do you not discern that the Question concerneth you and every man, as much as me? and that it is of æqual difficulty upon your own and others opinion, as upon mine? Dr. *Downame* will tell you as well as I, that Justification is a continued Act. So will Dr. *Twiss*, and all that with him do take it for an Immanent Act. Your self, who take it for a transient act but once performed, do yet judge (I doubt not,) that our Justified estate which is the effect of it, is permanent: and the relations of Reconciled, Pardoned, Adopted, are continued. Also you and they, I hope, will confess, that Justification passive is continued on the condition of continued faith. Now I would know how you will

avoid *Tompsons* Doctrince of Intercision, upon every notable defect of a Christians faith, when unbelief gives him a foyl, which is too common? as you answer, so will I. If you say his faith is not overcome habitually, when unbelief is prevalent in the present Act, I will say so of his obedience. 2. You know most Divines say as much as I, that obedience is a condition of the continuance of Justification, (only they say that faith only is the Instrument of Justifying,) and how will they answer you? 3. You know that all say, that obedience is a condition of Salvation, and so of our present Title to Salvation. Now how will they avoid *Tompsons* Doctrine of Intercision of that Title to Salvation, upon the commiting of such sins? 4. It is not perfect obedience which I say is the condition, but sincere: And by sincere I mean so much as may express that we unfeignedly take Christ still for our Lord and Saviour: And so it is not every sin that I say will forfeit or interrupt our Justification and cause it to discontinue, (that is, lose our Title, or change our Relation in Law:) no nor every gross sin: but only that sin which is inconsistent with the continued Accepting Christ for our Soveraign: that sin which breaks the main Covenant, (of which see Dr. *Preston* at large,) as Adultery or Desertion doth in marriage: A denying God to be our God, or Christ to be our Christ, by our works, while we confess him in word: An actual explicite or implicite Renunciation of Christ, and taking the flesh for our master, and the pleasing of it for our happiness; or as the *Mahometans* following a false Christ. Now, I hope that no justified person doth ever commit this sin; much less any elect and justified man, of whom *Tompson* speaks. You may see through his ninth *chap. part* 2. that *Tompson* erred through misunderstanding wherein the sincerity of Faith as justifying doth consist: (I wish many more do not so.) He thought that Justification did follow every act of undissembled Faith; but only rooted Faith would certainly persevere; and therefore the unrooted (Though true Believers) might lose their Justification, if they were Reprobates (*Præsciti* as he calls them;) or have it interrupted, if they were elect. But if he had known (what I have asserted in the aforesaid *cap.* 11. *part* 3.

of

of *Rest*, *Edit.*2.) that the very sincerity of faith as justifying, lyeth not in the natural being of the act meerly, but the prevalent Degree and moral specification, then he would have known, that his *unrooted* ones were never justified, & therefore never lost it. And if in asserting justification by the only act of Faith, he had not over-looked the use of the habit, he had not spoke so much of Intercision of Justification, through interruption of the acts, where the Habits remain. (Of this I must further explain my self, where it is more seasonable.) His Objections *pag.*21. *cap.*5. *part.* 1. I have answered in the place before cited. Yet even *Tompson* denyeth that ever sins once pardoned do return, or *Justificationem à peccatis semel remissis amitti.* (pag.11.part.1.cap.2.) *sed personam quæ aliquando justa fuit, posse contrahere, & aliquando actu contrahere per nova peccata, novum reatum iræ Divinæ & mortis æternæ*: So that it is not the loss of the first justification that he asserteth. I conclude then that as you and others answer *Tompson*, just so will I, (if you do it well:) for it concerneth my cause no more then yours, or other mens.

But Sir, you have drawn me so neer the difficulty which perplexeth me, that I will now open it to you. How to avoid the Intercision of justification, is a question that hath long troubled me: not on any of these terms proper to my own judgement; but how on your Grounds, or any Orthodox Divines it will be avoided. I would know 1. whether we are Guilty (not only *facti*, *sed pœnæ*) of every sin we commit? or of such sins as *David's*, before Repentance? if not guilty: then what need of Pardon, of daily praying Forgive us our Debts, or of a Christ to procure our Pardon? If we are Guilty, how can that consist with a justified state? *Reatus est obligatio ad Pœnam.* The least sin unpardoned, makes obnoxious to condemnation and Hell: He that is obnoxious to them, is not at present justified. Here I am much puzled, and in the dark. In my *Aphor.* I have slightly touched it, but so as doth not *quietare intellectum.* I deny the Intercision of universal Justification. Yet I dare not say but that a Believers sins may be unpardoned till he Repent, Believe and seek pardon. And I dare not think, that Christ teacheth us to pray only for pardon *in*

foro conscientiæ, or only of the temporal punishment, nor only for continuance of what we had before. But how to make personal universal uninterrupted Justification consist with the Guilt of one sin, or with one sin unpardoned, here is the knot. Our British Divines in *Dort Synod. Act. de Persever. Thes.5.pag.* 266. say, that *Believers by such sins Reatum mortis incurrunt. Prideaux Lect.6 de persev. pag.*80. saith, they do *reatum damnabilem contrahere, sic ut saltem demeritorie, licet non effectivè, jus ad regnum cælorum penitus amittant:* (This distinction doth no good: for we pray not, Forgive us our trespasses, *i.e.* that they may not *deserve* Death) Mr. *Burges* of *Justif. Lect.* 27. *pag.*242. thinks, *They have an actual Guilt obliging them to eternal wrath not absolutely, but conditionally till they take the means appointed of God for their pardon: for God doth not will to them salvation while they abide in that state.* Mr. *Reynolds* (*Life of Christ, pag.*404. 442, 443, 496.) saith, that *they certainly incur Gods displeasure and create a merit of Death, and deserve Damnation, but* de facto *bring it not.* Now all this openeth not mine understanding to see, How a man is *Reus mortis*, and yet perfectly justified (and so, *non-condemnandus etiam in sententia Legis*) at the same moment of time. And were it a thing that should be *futurum*, (which we may suppose) that he should dye in that state, whether he should be justified at Judgement, and so be saved, or not? Sir, though I refuse not to accept your further Animadversions on the former Points, yet (being indeed satisfied pretty well in them) I chiefly intreat that you would communicate to me your thoughts of this one Point as soon as you can, if you have any clear way to untye the knot: and if your Grounds conduce to it more then mine, I shall like them better.

Sir, pardon the prolixity here, and Acrimony elsewhere of

Your unfeigned well-willer,

RICHARD BAXTER.

THE Reader *must understand that since the Writing of this, I have endeavoured to clear this point in my Directions for Peace of Conscience. To which now I add but this, that besides a Plenary Guilt or Remission, there seems to be a Guilt and Remission that are both but imperfect and of a middle sort: that is, that as in* Peters *act of sin, the habit of faith remained, so with his Guilt, a state of Justification remained: As none of his old sins returned on him, so the Covenant of Grace upon his Habitual Faith did hinder the Guilt from being Plenary or fixed, by beginning a Remission; I fear not to call it an imperfect Remission: The Law doth pronounce Death on a man for every sin, & it is so far in force as to determine that* Death is both deserved and due to this man for this sin. *But at the same instant, though after in order of nature, the Gospel that giveth pardon to Believers, doth give an Imperfect pardon to* David, Peter *and such Habitual Believers as soon as they sin, before Faith and Repentance for that sin be actuall; and their Pardon will become plenary when they actually Repent and Believe. Their Sin is like the fault of a Kings Son or Subject, that in a Passion should strike the King, When yet Habitually he hath a loving Loyal heart to him. He deserveth Death, and by Law it may be his due; but he is a Son still, and the King will not take this advantage against him, though he will not fully pardon him, till he submit and lament his Fault. We are still the Children of God, notwithstanding those sins that go against the Habitual bent of our Hearts (for thats the Tryal;) but must have actual Faith and Repentance before we shall have full pardon: Whether you will call that Pardon which the Promise giveth upon meer habitual Repentance,* A vertual Pardon, *and that which it giveth on actual Repentance,* an actual Pardon; *or What name you will give it, I leave to consideration; but compleat it is not in a case of heynous sin, till Actual Repentance: Though it may be in a case of some unknown,*

known, unobserved or forgotten infirmities. For the full condition is necessary to a full Pardon. He is near the case of a man that hath a Pardon granted him for Murder, but for want of some action to be performed, he hath not yet possession of it, and cannot yet plead it. If you ask me what should become of such a man, if he so die before Repentance; I answer. 1. *I think it is a case that will never fall out: For* 1. *God is as it were engaged by Love and Promise, and by giving his indwelling Spirit to Believers, to bring them to Repentance.* 2. *The new Nature or Disposition of such a man will not suffer him to be long without Actual Repentance, at least in some measure; especially when Death shall look him in the face. I doubt not but* David *did repent before* Nathan *spoak to him; but God would not take up with so short and secret a Repentance for so great and odious a Crime.* 2. *But if you can prove it profitable for such a man to be suddenly cut off before Repentance, and that such a thing will be, I should incline to think that he will be fully pardoned at the instant of Death, and so saved; because the Lord knoweth that he repented Habitually and virtually, and would have done it actually, if he had had time for consideration.* 3. *Or if we should conclude that God hath purposely left men of such a middle condition, without any certainty how he will deal with them, that so no man may be encouraged to sin, and in Impudency, I think it no dangerous Doctrine, nor injurious to the Body of saving Truth. And thus I have now (many years since the writing of the foregoing Papers) told you in brief what satisfieth me concerning this difficult point, for the reconciling of the guilt of every particular sin, especially the more haynous, with the Doctrine of persevering, uninterrupted Justification. Somewhat also I have said of it in my Papers expressing my* Judgement about Perseverance, *lately published.*

Jan. 5. 1657.

R.

THE FOURTH DISPVTATION.

Qu. Whether the Faith which *Paul* oppoſeth to *Works* in the Point of *Juſtification*, be one only Phyſical *Act* of the ſoul? *Neg.*

OR,

Whether all Humane *Acts*, except one Phyſical *Act* of Faith, be the Works which are excluded by *Paul* in the Point of *Juſtification*? *Neg.*

By *Richard Baxter*.

LONDON,
Printed by *R.W.* for *Nevil Simmons*, Book-ſeller in *Kederminſter*, and are to be ſold by him there, and by *Nathaniel Ekins* at the Gun in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1658.

Question. Whether the Faith which *Paul* opposeth to *Works* in the Point of *Justification*, be one only Physical Act of the *Soul*? *Neg.*

OR, Whether all Humane Acts, except one Physical Act of Faith, be the Works which are excluded by *Paul* in the Point of Justification? *Neg.*

I PUT these two Questions together for brevity and Elucidation of the Matter in doubt; for so in effect they are but One. avoiding all unnecessary Explication of terms concerning which we are agreed; it is but little that I have need to say for your understanding of the sense of the Question.

1. It is here supposed that *Paul* doth maintain Justification by Faith, and opposeth it to Justification

by the works of the Law: and so oppoſeth Salvation by Grace and by works. 2. It is ſuppoſed that *non datur tertium*, there is no middle way of Juſtification beſides theſe two, *by faith*, or *by Works*: and therefore whatſoever Acts we are here juſtified by, it muſt needs follow, that thoſe Acts are none of the [*Works*] that *Paul* here ſpeaketh of as excluded: and whatſoever Acts are excluded are none of the *Faith*, by which *Paul* telleth us here that we are juſtified. This we are agreed on, and ſo it is often preſſed by my Opponents that there is no third way; which I grant them. But note that I do not therefore grant them that there is no *tertium*, or other act either implyed in *Faith*, or *ſubſervient to it* in that *way* of Juſtification that is by *Faith*: It was never *Pauls* meaning to exclude all other Gracious Acts relating to Chriſt, no not from this buſineſs of Juſtification, as attendants on Faith, or modifications of it, implyed in it, or ſubſervient to it, And therefore it will not follow that any third thing by which we are thus juſtified, is either *Faith* or *Works*; but only that is not *Works*, becauſe they are excluded.

3. I put the Phyſical Act whoſe Unity we ſpeak of, in contradiſtinction to one moral Fact, which may contain many Phyſical Acts: ſuch as Marriage, which is one in a civil or moral ſenſe, but many Phyſical Acts: and ſuch as almoſt all Contracts be; as taking a man to be my Prince, my Commander, my Tutor, my Phyſician, my Councellor, *&c.* which every one of them contain many Phyſical acts.

4. There is a fourfold Unity here to be diſcerned, that the term [*One*] may be underſtood. 1. A general Unity, and this is not it in queſtion. We are agreed that *in genere actus*, and *in genere actus ſecundi*, and *in genere actus immanentis*, Faith is but *One*. 2. A Unity of the loweſt *Genus*, and the *ſuperi* or *ſpecies*. 3. A Unity of the *ſpecies ſpecialiſſima*. 4. A *Numerical Unity*. Our Queſtion is of the third: but yet becauſe the *ſecond* and *fourth* are alſo controverted, I ſhall ſpeak of them before I come to the Queſtion. And concerning the *fourth* I Aſſert, that [*The Faith which* Paul *oppoſeth to Works in the Point of Juſtification, is not only one numerical Act of the Soul.*

My

My Opponents in this (though they are unwilling to appear in the oppofition) muſt needs be all thoſe that ſay, Juſtification is *ſimul & ſemel*, at once and but once, and that it is a good Argument againſt any acts or works after Faith that [*They exiſt not till we are juſtified, therefore they are no conditions of our Juſtification*:] and all thoſe that deny and ſcorn the diſtinction between 1. Our Juſtification at the firſt (or putting us into a juſtified ſtate) 2. And our daily Juſtification by the continuation of that ſtate. 3. And our frequently reiterated particular Juſtification from the Guilt of particular ſins. 4. And our final Juſtification by the ſentence of the Judge. Eſpecially by denying the ſecond, they muſt needs deny my Aſſertion, as ſhall be ſhewed anon.

Argum. 1. *If* Paul *ſpeak not only of Juſtification as begun, but as continued, then the Faith which he oppoſeth to Works is not only one numerical Act.* (For there muſt needs go ſome other Numerical Act before it, or elſe the perſon could not be juſtified by faith before) But the *Antecedent is true*, as I prove from *Rom.* 4. 18, 19. and *Gal.* 3. If *Paul* prove Juſtification by faith, from the Inſtance of *Abrahams* believing after that he was juſtified, then he ſpeaketh not only of Juſtification as begun (or of our firſt Being juſtified) But the Antecedent is plain in the Text compared with *Gen.* 12. and 13 and 14 and 15. *Abraham* was a juſtified man before he believed the Promiſe of *Sara*'s having a Son.

Argum. 2 *If a true Believer have a juſtifying Faith after his firſt Juſtification, even as long as he liveth, then the Faith which* Paul *oppoſeth to works is not only one numerical Act* (becauſe that firſt Numerical Act doth not continue with us.) *But the Antecedent is true*, as appeareth 1. from the forementioned Inſtance of *Abraham*. 2, From the neceſſity of a continued *Active* Juſtification: For the *Paſſive* elſe would ceaſe, and we ſhould be unjuſtified. If God did not continue to forgive us, and ſtill actively repute us juſt, and accept us as juſt and impute Righteouſneſs to us, and his Goſpel Grant did not continually juſtifie us, (as every *Fundamentum* continually cauſeth the Relation,) we ſhould ceaſe to be juſtified: And Gods active Juſtification continueth not without the con-

tinuance of mans Actual or Habitual Faith : Otherwise he should justifie an Infidel , and he should justifie afterwards in another way,and on other terms then he did at first. 3. From the continued Efficacy of Christs Merits, Intercession and Covenant, which daily justifie us. So that he that saith, that he was never justified but once at one moment,and by one numerical Act of Faith, must say that Christ was his Justifier actually but for a moment,and that he will not be beholden to him to justifie him any more.

And yet that no man may have a pretence of quarrelling about meer words, that hath a mind to it,let it still be remembred, that as the word [Justification] is used to signifie the first making a man just that was unjust (relatively or qualitatively,) So I confess that God, that Christ, that the Covenant do justifie us Universally but once (though particularly from particular sins often) And thus it is but one Act of Faith by which we are justified Relatively, and not the Habit at all. But as Justification is taken for the same Act continued (though the mutation on us be not *ab eodem termino*) so we are justified every moment, and have a justifying faith continually, and are justified by the Habit, at least as much as by the Act, and in some respect more. The Sun doth as truly Illuminate our part of the world all day after,as at Sun rising, and by the same Action or Emanation in kind : But as *Illuminating* is taken for turning night into day , or illuminating the dark world from its darkness,so it doth only illuminate it from break of day to Sun rising. Your Lease of your house or Land doth first make you a Tenant of no-Tenant at the first sealing and delivering : but it may by the same sort of action continue your Right till it expire , and so continue you a Tenant ; And thus we are continually justified by God, by Christ, by the Covenant and by Faith.

Now as to the second kind or matter of Unity (of an *Inferior Genus and Superior species* ;) this is two-fold. 1. As the Acts of mans soul are specified and denominated from the *Faculties* or *Powers* : or (if any deny that real distinction of faculties) from the Objects of Intellection, Volition, *&c.* generally considered. 2. As the acts of the soul are specified

by

by their *special Objects* (though not *speciei specialissimæ*) As to the former, the question is one of these two (which you will in terms, for they are one in sense) *Whether the act of Faith which* Paul *opposeth to Works in Justification, be only an act of the Intellect, or only an act of the Will?* Or, *Whether it have only Entity and Verity, or only Goodness for its Object?* And in the second case the Question is this, *Whether God alone, or Christ alone, or the Promise alone, or Pardon or Righteousness alone, or Heaven alone* &c. *be the Object of that Faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification.*

But the thing intended in our Question is *de speciei specialissima, Whether it be but one special act which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification.* Here are three more Propositions that I shall handle in order, though the last only be necessary to me.

Proposition 2. *The Faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification, is not only an Act of the Intellect, nor only of the Will.*

I shall say but little of this, because I have among Protestants but few Adversaries. The Papists indeed seat it in the Intellect only: and so doth *Camero* (calling it a Persuasion) and some few Protestants: some few others (as *Amesius* sometimes) place it only in the Will, and take Assent to be but a presupposed Act: and they call it Affiance, or (as *Amesius*) also *Election, Acceptance*, or *Consent*, or embracing, or Recumbency, or such like. *Pemble* taking Truth and Goodness to be all one, and the Understanding and Will for all one, takes also Assent and Affiance for all one; but I shall go on the supposition that his singular opinion is commonly disallowed; however the *Scotists*, and many others deny the real Distinction of Faculties. The common Vote of Protestant Divines is, that Faith is in both Faculties, the Intellect and Will, and hath for its object the Entity of Christs person, and the Verity of the Gospel, and the goodness of Christ and his benefits offered, which Faith accepteth. *Davenants* Words are plain and true, *Determ.* Qu. 38. pag. 174. *In actu fidei justificantis tota anima se convertit ad causam justificantem: And* qu. 37. pag. 166. *Fides illa quam Scriptura agnoscit ha-*

bet in se complicatum actum Voluntatis & Intellectus —— Neq; nobis absurdum, sed valde consentaneum videtur actum illum quo tota anima purificatur & justificatur ad totam animam pertinere; it aut in nudo intellectu habeat initium; in voluntate complementum.

Argument 1. *The Object of this Faith is both Truth and Goodness:* Therefore it is the act both of the Intellect and the Will. That Truth is the Object of it is evident, 1. In that the Metaphysical Verity of Christs person is the Object of it, or else Christ were not the Object of it. 2. In that the moral Verity of the Gospel, 1. as revealing Christ, 2. as promising pardon, is the object of it, as is confest, and the Scripture doth so plentifully declare, that it were superfluous to cite the words.

That goodness is the object of it, appeareth, 1. In that Christ as Redeemer, Mediator, Saviour, is the object of it, and that is, Christ as necessary and good to us. It is Christ for our forgiveness, Justification and Salvation: and so under the formal notion of good. 2. In that it is a Promise as a Promise (Testament, Grant, or Deed of Gift) that is the Object by it. And it is Essential to these to be good to us as well as True: and the Truth is but for the good. 3. In that it is Pardon, Justification and Life eternal finally, that are the object of it; which as such, and as offered to us, are good. If I thought these things needed proof, I would give you more.

Argument 2. *The Scripture revealeth to us that this Faith is the Act both of the Intellect and the Will, therefore it is so.* That it is the act of the Intellect, is so plain in Scripture, that I should accuse my self of wearying you with needless work, if I should go about to prove it. The Papists are right enough in thus much: and Dr. *Downame de Justific.* and against *Pemble* in *Append. to Covenant of Grace*, hath proved it at large. That it is an act of the Will, our Divines have fully proved against the Papists in many a full Discourse; 1. From the sense of πιστευειν εις Θεον, & εις Ιησουν Χριστον, & πιστις εν τω αιματι, which signifie Affiance, and such an Affiance as is the act of the Will as well as of the Intellect. 2. Because the Scripture often putteth

[*Willing*

[*Willing*] as equipollent to Believing; in *Revel.*22.17. *Whosoever* Will, *let him take the water of Life freely*] where *Willing* and *Taking* are both acts of the Will, and the faith in question; so in other places. 3. The Scripture calleth it by the name of *Receiving* Christ, *Joh.*1.12. *Col.*2.6. which is the Acceptance or consent of the Will. 4. The Scripture often makes Faith to be the Internal covenanting and closure of the heart with Christ, which is the act of the Will; and therefore it perswadeth with the Will to this end; and accuseth men as unwilling, and calleth them Refusers, Neglecters, Slighters, Rejecters, Despisers of Christ, that are Unbelievers (privatively.) I trouble you not to cite the Texts as being needless, and done by many. Besides that (as in the former Argument) the Promise, Christ, Pardon, Life, and other good things, as good, are frequently made the Object of Faith.

Argument 3. *The Veracity of God is the formal Object of Faith. But the Veracity of God is his Goodness (or participateth at least as much of his Goodness as of his Wisdom and his Power:) therefore the Goodness of God is the formal Object of Faith: and consequently it is an act of the Will. God cannot lye, because he is perfectly good, wise and Powerfull.*

Object. But (say some Papists) *All these acts that you mention here, are Love and not Faith: Faith doth but assent, and Love consenteth or accepteth.*

Answ. 1. Do you not your selves call it *fides formata charitate*? And why then may not we call it faith? 2. The Scripture calleth it Faith in the phrases formentioned, πίστις ἐν τῷ αἵματι πιστεύειν εἰς χριστὸν, &c. and therefore it is Faith. 3. Though sometimes in other cases the Apostle distinguish Faith, Hope and Love; yet when he speaketh of Faith as justifying, and as the form of a Christian, he comprehendeth Love to Christ as Saviour in it, and a confidence in him, such as in common Language we call Hope. As Love signifieth the Passion of the soul, it may be a consequent; but as it is but the *velle Christum, & beneficia oblata*, so it is faith it self, as *Maccovius* and *Chamier* have truly told the Papists. It was a faith in Christ (though beginning to sink) thats expressed *Luk.* 24.21.

24. 21. [Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ισραήλ.] [*But we trusted that it had been he that should have redeemed Israel.*] Our Translators have put *We Trusted* for *We Hoped*, because they thought the signification the same, or else they would not sure have done it. And when the Apostle saith, that Ἔστι πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, *Heb.* 11. 1. If we may denominate the act from the Object, we may see that he there makes Faith and Hope to be co-essential. And when Christ is called Χριστὸς ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν, Christ *our Hope*, it seems *hope* there is but an act of Faith. And so 2 *Cor.* 1. 10. 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. To *Hope in God or Christ*, or *put our Hope in him*, seemeth to me all one as to put *our Trust in him for future Mercy*, which is Faith. To which is opposed 1 *Tim.* 6. 17. *putting our Hope in riches.* So 1 *Cor.* 15. 19. *to have Hope in Christ*, so the Septuagint, *Psal.* 42. 26. ἔλπισον ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν: [*Hope in God*,] is a Complication of Faith and Hope in one word, and translated by us, *Trust in God.*

4. Though the Willing, Consent or Acceptance of an offered Benefit, have truly somewhat of Love in it, yet Love is not the proper name of that Act. Every Volition is not usually called Love.

Prop. 3. *It is not not only God the Father, nor only Christ the Redeemer, nor only the Promise, nor only pardon, or Righteousness, or Heaven, that is the object of that faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification.*

Argument 1. If many or all these are so linked together, that to believe one of them as revealed in Scripture, is to believe more or all, then it is not any one of them alone that is the object of that Faith which *Paul* opposeth to works. But the *Antecedent* is true, as is evident, e. g: *To believe in Christ*, is to *believe the promise of the Gospel concerning Christ.* For there is no *Belief* without a *Word of revelation* to believe. So that here *Christ* and the *Promise* are necessarily conjunct, and Christ and the Gospel History. And to *believe the Gospel* with a Divine Faith, is to *Believe Gods veracity*, and to believe the Gospel *because* of Gods Veracity: For this is the *Objectum formale* without which there is no faith. So that *Believing in God* is essential

essential to all Divine faith. Also *materially*, to *Believe in Christ*, is to *Believe in him as our Saviour, to save us from the Guilt of sin*, even as *to believe in a Physitian* is to Trust on him to cure us of our Diseases. So *forgiveness of sin*, being an end essential to Christs Office, it is essential to our Faith in Christ. So also to believe in Christ as a Saviour, is to believe in him *as one that is able and willing to reconcile us*, and bring us to the *favour* of God: And so *God and his favour and Reconciliation* with him are ends essential to the office of a Saviour (as health is to the Physitians) and therefore they are essential to our *Belief in a Saviour*. The same may be said of eternal Life: so that you may see that these have essential respects to one another, and Christ cannot be believed in alone without the rest as co-essentials respectively in the object of our faith. Nor can the Promise be believed without believing in the Promiser and Promised.

Argument 2. *The Scripture most expresly maketh many such Objects of that faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in Justification; therefore so must we.*

Rom. 3.22,24,25.26. There are expresly mentioned all these Objects of justifying faith. 1. *The Righteousness of God.* 2. *The Person of Jesus Christ.* 3. *Redemption by Christ, and his propitiatory blood.* 4. *Remission of sins past.* 5. *God as a Justifier of Believers*; see the Text.

Rom. 4 3,5.6,7,8,17-20,21,24,25. There are all these objects of Justifying faith expressed, even when the work of Justification is described. 1. *God as Reveuler and true*: 2. *God as Justifier.* 3. *Righteousness; imputation of it; forgiveness of sin, not imputing it.* 4. *God as Omniscent.* 5. *God as Omnipotent.* 6. *Jesus our Lord.* 7. *The death of Christ for our offences.* 8. *The Resurrection of Christ for our Justification.* 9. *God as the raiser of Christ from the Dead.* Read the words, and you shall find them all expresly mentioned. I think it superfluous to cite more Texts.

Prop. 4. *The faith which* Paul *opposeth to works in the business of Justification, is not any one single Physical act in* Specie specialissima: *Nor was it ever the meaning of* Paul *to exclude all acts except some such one, from Justification, under the name of Works.*

For the proof of this, it is done already, if any one of the three former Propositions be proved. To which I add Argument 1. *from an instance of some other particulars.* If any or all the following particular Acts be such as are not to be reckoned with works, then it is no one act alone that *Paul* opposeth to works. But all or some of the following acts are such as are not to be reckoned with works excluded. *Ergo, &c.*

E. g. 1. An Assent to the truth of the Gospel in general as the Word of God. 2. A belief on Gods Veracity in this expreſt. 3. An Assent to the Truth of the Word that telleth us that Christ is God. 4. An Assent to the truth of the Article of Christs Manhood. 5. An Assent to the Truth of the Article of his conception by the Holy Ghost, and being born of a Virgin. 6. And to the Article of his being born without original sin in himself. 7. And to the Article of his sinless holy life. 8. And to the Article of his actual death. 9. And that this death was for our sins. 10. And that God hath accepted it as a sufficient Ransom, sacrifice or Attonement. 11. And that he actually rose again from the dead, and overcame death. 12. And that he is the Lord and King of the Church. 13. And that he is the Prophet and Teacher of the Church. 14. And that he is ascended into Heaven and Glorified, God and man. 15. And that he is now our Intercessor & Mediator with the Father. 16. And that he hath purchased by his Ransom and given or offered in the Gospel, the free pardon of sin. 17. And that he hath also purchased & offered us eternal life in Glory with God. 18. And that its the members of Christ, and of the Holy Catholick Church, that shall partake of pardon and life by Christ. 19. And that he will give us the Resurrection of life at last. 20. And that he will judge the world. I have omitted our special Belief in God the Father as Creator, and in the Holy Ghost, and have given you in these twenty Acts, no more then what is contained in this one word, [*I believe in Christ as Christ*] I think there is if any, but few that are not essential to Faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour. And all these acts of assent are parts of the faith that is the means of our Justification; and none of them part of the excluded works. And besides all these there are as many acts of the Will as of the Intellect concurring in or to this very

ry assent, so that there's twenty more. For its plain, that seeing the objects of all these are Good as well as True, they being all Truths concerning our benefit and Salvation, the Will it self in the Intellects assenting, doth command it to assent, and also doth place a certain Affiance in the Revealer, which we call in English *crediting* or *Giving credit to one*, we *rest* our selves upon his Truth. As I said before, *Veracity* is Gods *Goodness*, and Veracity is the formal Object in every one of the other Acts about the material Object; and therefore the Will must act upon *Veracity*, and so have a part in assent it self: not *as assent*, but as a *Voluntary assent*, and as an *assent* to *Promises* or *Revelations* of *good to us*. There is goodness in the word of Revelation subordinate, or in order to the good Revealed. And so there is an act of the *Will* upon the good in the Word, complicated with the Intellects Assent, besides the following fuller act of the Will, upon Christ and the benefits themselves. And therefore there is a twofold Affiance. 1. An Affiance in *Gods Veracity as the Revealer*. 2. An Affiance in *Christ the Mediator, as the bestower, accomplisher and actual Saviour or Deliverer* according to his Office aud Covenant. The first is an act of the Will concurring with Assent. And of this *Pembles* opinion is neer Truth, though not fully it. For here Affiance is as closely joyned with Assent as Heat in the Sun with Light, though they are not the same. But then the second sort of Affiance followeth Assent, and hath another act of the Will interceding, which is Consent or acceptance of the Benefit offered; which also is closely conjunct with the first act of the Will. And then followeth last of all affiance in Christ for the performance of the undertaken acts. And these latter are also many particular Physical acts, as the objects *in specie specialissima* are many. And yet all these make but one object in a moral sense, and so but one act, and are done in a few moments of time of which after. Would it not be too tedious, I should stay to cite several Texts, to prove that never a one of all these acts is excluded as works by *Paul*. But of divers of them its before proved from *Rom.* 2. and 4 and of more in *Heb.* 11. and in *Gal.* 3. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 20, 21, 22. There are at least these Objects of Justifying faith expressed. 1. *Christs Person*, 2. tha

he was the seed promised. 3. That he *was crucified.* 4. That this was *for our sins.* 5. That *he was made a curse for us in this his death.* 6. That *hereby he Redeemed us from the curse.* 7. That *he is the Mediator.* 8. *God as the Party with whom he is Mediator.* 9. *God as Believed in his Promise.* 10. *God as Justifier.* 11. *The Gospel preached, and the Promise made.* 12. *Blessedness by Christ.* 13. *The confirmed Covenant.* 14. *The Inheritance.* 15 *Righteousness.* 16. *Adoption.* 17. *That Belief* is the means, and *believers* the subjects of these benefits. All these objects of Faith you will find in the Text.

Argument 2. *Ex natura rei.* If other acts of faith in Christ *are* no more works then that one (whatsoever it be) which you will say *Paul* opposeth to works, then *Paul* doth not *call* them works, or number them with works. But the *Antecedent* is true, therefore so is the *Consequent.* Doubtless the Scripture calls them as they are: and therefore if they are not works, it calls them not works. And for the *Antecedent*, 1. If by *works* you mean the Keeping of the first Covenant by sinless obedience, so neither the one or the other are works. 2. If you mean the keeping of *Moses* Law, so neither of them are *works.* 3. If you mean the performance of an act of obedience to any Precept of God, so the several acts are *works*, but justifie not as acts of obedience to the command (that's but their matter) but as the condition of the Promise. 4. If you mean that they are *Acts* of the soul of man, so every act of Faith is a work, though it justifie not as such, so that here is no difference to be found. *E.g.* If you make the Believing in Christ as Dying, (though you take in both assent and affiance) to be the only justifying act; what reason can you give why our Believing in Christ incarnate, in Christ obeying the Law, in Christ rising again, and Glorified and Interceding, in Christ actually now giving out the pardon of sin and Adoption, *&c.* should be called *works* any more then our Believing in Christ as crucified? No reason at all, nor any Scripture can be brought for it. Yea what reason have you that our Believing in Christ as the Physitian of our souls, to cure us of our sins, and cleanse our hearts, and sanctifie our Natures, and in Christ as the Teacher and Guide of our souls to life eternal, should be called works

any

any more then the other? Or that believing in Christs blood for everlasting Life and happiness, should be any more called works then believing in his blood for Justification? Yea that Believing in him as the King, and Head, and Captain of his Church to subdue their enemies, and by his Government conduct them to perseverance and to Glory, should any more be called *works* then believing on him as crucified in order to forgiveness?

Argument 3. All acts Essential to faith in Christ as Christ, are opposed to works by *Paul* in the point of Justification, and are not the works opposed to Faith. But many acts are essential to faith in Christ as Christ; therefore they are many acts that are opposed to works; and no one of those acts is the works excluded.

The *Major* is proved thus: If faith in Christ as such, be it that *Paul* oppoeth to works, then every essential part of it is by *Paul* opposed to works (for it is not faith in Christ if it want any essential part) But the *Antecedent* is true. *Ergo.*—— The *Minor* I have proved in the first Disputation: Though sometime it is said to be [*by faith is his blood*] that we have remission of sin; and sometime that we are justified *if we believe in him that raised Christ from the dead*, &c. Yet most frequently it is said to be *by faith in Christ*; *by believing in the Lord Jesus, receiving Christ Jesus the Lord* &c. *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, was the Gospel preached to the Jaylor, *Act.* 16. But this is sufficiently proved already. That many acts are essential to faith in Christ as such, is also proved: and particularly, that believing in him as our Teacher, Lord, and as Rising, Interceding, and Justifying by sentence and Gift, as well as believing in him as dying for our Justification. As Christ is not Christ (as to his Office and work) without these Essentials, so faith is not the Christian faith without these acts.

But here observe that though I say these acts of faith are not the works which *Paul* excludeth, I speak of them as they *are*, and not as they are *misunderstood*: For if any man should imagine that Believing in Christ is a Legal Meritorious work, and *that* can justifie him of or for it self; I will not deny but ha

he may so make *another thing* of faith, and so bring it among excluded works (if it be possible for him to believe contradictories:) But then, this is as true of one act of Faith as another: If a man imagine that its thus Meritorious to Believe in Christ as purchasing him Justification, it is as much the excluded works, as to think it Meritorious to Believe in him as our Teacher, or King and Judge, that will lead us to final Absolution, and actually justifie us by his Sentence at that Judgement.

Argument 4. Those acts of Faith that are necessary to Justification, are none of the works that *Paul* excludeth from Justification (unless changed by misunderstanding, as aforesaid.) But other acts of faith as well as one are necessary to Justification: *Ergo.*——

The *Minor* (which only is worthy the labour of a proof) 1. is proved before, and in the first Disputation. 2. And it is confessed by my Opponents, that say [*Faith in Christ as Teacher, King, &c. is the* fides quæ Justificat, *and the condition of Justification, as Repentance also is, though it be not the Instrumental cause, as they think some other Act is.* *Paul* doth not exclude that which he makes necessary.

Argument 5. That which makes not the Reward to be of Debt and not of Grace, is none of the works that *Paul* sets faith against. But other acts of faith in Christ do not make the reward to be of Debt and not of Grace any more then the *one* act which you will choose (*E. g.* Believing in Christ as King and Teacher, any more then believing in him as a Ransom:) therefore they are not the works that *Pauls* sets faith against. The *Major* is proved from the Description of the excluded works, *Rom.* 4.4. The *Minor* is evident.

Argument 6. All acts of Faith in Christ *as our Justifier*, are such as are opposed to works by *Paul*, and are none of the works which faith is opposed to. But they are more then one or two that are Acts of faith in Christ as Justifier: *Ergo.*——

The Major I think will be granted; the Minor is plain: For

1. Christ

1. Christ justifieth us meritoriously as a Sacrifice. 2. And as Obeying and fulfilling the Law. 3. As the complement of his satisfaction, and the entrance upon his following execution, his Resurrection justifieth us. 4. As the Heavenly Priest at Gods right hand, he justifieth us by his Intercession. 5. As King and Head, he justifieth us by his Covenant or Law of Grace. 6. As King and Judge he justifieth us by sentence. 7. As Prophet he teacheth us the Doctrine of Justification, and how to attain to Justification by sentence. So that at least, none of these are the excluded works.

Argum. 7. If the whole Essence of Christian faith be opposed to works, and so be none of the opposed works in the matter of Salvation, then its so also in the matter of Justification. But the Antecedent is true; therefore so is the Consequent.

The Minor is confessed by my Opponents. The consequence of the Major I prove. 1. Because Salvation is as free as Justification, and no more of works which *Paul* excludeth. 2. Salvation comprehendeth Justification: and Glorification hath the same conditions as final Justification at Judgement, it being part of Justification to adjudge that Glory. 3. The expres Scripture excludes works as much from Salvation as from Justification: Eph. 2. 8,9. *For by Grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.* Tit. 3.5,6,7. [*Not by works of Righteousness which We have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs according to the hope of eternal Life.*] Many such places are obvious to any diligent Reader. For the Minor also read 1 *Cor.* 15.1,2,3,4, 5,6, *&c.*

Argum. 8. If no man can *name any one* Act of faith that is opposed to all *the rest* as *works*, or opposed to works when the

the rest are not, then no such thing it to be asserted. But no man can name the Act that is thus opposed alone to works. 1. It is not yet done that I know of. We cannot get them to tell us what Act it is. 2. And if they do, others will make as good a claim to the Prerogative.

Argum. 9. They that oppose us, and affirm the Question, do feign God to have a strange partiality to one Act of faith above all the rest, without any reason or aptitude in that act to be so exalted. But this is not to be feigned (and proved it cannot be,) that God should annex our Justification to the Belief in Christ as a sacrifice only; and to oppose this to belief in him as Rising, Interceding, Teaching, Promising or Judging, is a fiction contrary to Scripture. Examine any Text you please, and see whether it will run well with such an Exposition, *Rom.* 4.4,5. [*Now to him that worketh, i. e. Believeth in Christ as Teacher, Judge, Intercessor,* &c. *is the reward not reckoned of Grace but of Debt. But to him that worketh not, that is, believeth not on Christ as King and Teacher,* &c. *but Believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly* (an act of his Kingly office) *&c.* ——Doth this run well? I will not trouble you with so unsavoury a Paraphrase upon the like Scriptures: you may try at pleasure on *Rom.* 3. & 4. and *Gal.* 3. *Eph.* 2. *Phil.* 3. or any such Text.

Argument 10. If the Doctrine of the Opponents (holding the Affirmative) were true, then no man can tell whether he be a condemned Legalist, or not: yea more, if it be not faith in Christ as such (containing the whole Essence) by which we are justified, as opposed to works, or which is none of the excluded works; then no man can tell but he is a condemned Legalist. But the *Consequent is* false; therefore so is the *Antecedent.*

The Reason of the Consequence is, because no man is able to tell you which is the sole justifying Act, or which are the only acts, if it be not faith Essentially that is it; for among all the acts before mentioned, if a man mistake and think one other

other (*E. g.* faith in Christs Resurrection, in Christ as King, Judge, Teacher, *&c.*) is it by which he must be justified, then he falls upon Justification by Works, and so falls short of Grace: for if it be of Works, then it is no more of Grace: else Works were no Works. And so no man can tell but he destroyeth Grace, and expecteth Justification by works: much less can weak Christians tell. I never yet saw or heard from any Divine a just Nomination (with proof) of the one Justifying act, or a just Enumeration of the many acts, if all must not be taken in that are Essential. Some say Affiance is the only act: but as thats confuted by the most that take in Assent also, so there are many and many acts of Affiance in Christ that are necessary: and they should tell us which of these it is.

Object. *And do you think that we can any better tell when we have all that are Essential? Or doth every weak Christian believe all the twenty Articles that you mentioned at first?*

Answ. 1. We can better know what is Revealed then whats unrevealed. The Scripture tells us what faith in Christ is; but not what one or two acts do Justifie, excluding all other as Works. Divines have often defined Faith; but I know not that any hath defined any such one act, as thus exalted above the rest of the Essence of Faith. If we covld not tell what is essential to Faith, we could not tell what faith is. 2. The twenty Objects of Assent before mentioned are not all Articles or material Objects: the second is the formal Object. And of the rest, unless the fifth [*Believing that Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of a Virgin*] may be excepted (which I dare not affirm) I know not of one thats not essential to Christianity. And I think if we had Hereticks among us that denyed Christ to be conceived by the Holy Ghost, we should scarce take them for Christians. But that man that shall deny or not believe that Christ is God, that he is Man, that he was no sinner, that he dyed, and that for our sins, and that he was a Sacrifice or Ransom for us, and that he Rose

again, is Glorified, and will judge us: that he hath offered us a pardon of sin; that there will be a Resurrection of the body, and life Everlasting by this our Redeemer, I cannot see how he can be a Christian. And for the number of Articles, I left out much of the ancient Creed it self, (the Belief in God the Father, Creator, &c. in the Holy Ghost: the Article of the Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, of Christs burial, Descent into Hell, and more.) And yet do you think this too big to be essential to Christian Faith? If so, tell not any Heretick that denyeth any one of these, that he denyeth an Essential Article of our faith.

But for the ignorant weak Christian, I say, 1. He knoweth all these Articles that I have named; but 2. perhaps not with so ripe a manner of apprehension as is formed into mental words, or which he can express in words to others: I find my self in my studies, that I have somtimes an apprehension of a Truth before I have ripened that conception for an expression. 3, And perhaps they are not Methodical and Distinct in their conceptions, and cannot say that there are just so many Articles. Every sick man can understand what it is to desire and accept of such a man to be his Physitian; and herein he first verily desireth health, and secondly, desireth Physick as a means to Health, and thirdly, desireth the Physitian in order to the use of that means, and fourthly, therein doth take him to be a Physitian, and fifthly, to have competent skill, and sixthly, to be in some measure faithful, to be trusted, and seventhly, doth place some confidence in him, &c. all this and more is truly in his mind; and yet perhaps they are not ripened and measured into such distinct conceptions, as that he can distinctly tell you all this in tolerable Language, or doth observe then as distinct Conceptions in himself (and whether *uno intuitu* the eye and the Intellect may not see many Objects, though *ab objectis*, the acts must be called many and divers, is a Controversie among Philosophers; and as I remember *Pet. Hurtad. de Mendoza* affirmeth it.) But if you your selves will form all these into distinct conceptions, and ask your Catechist his judgement of them, its like

he

he can mak you perceive at leaft by a *Yea* or *Nay*, that he underſtands them all. The new formed body of the Infant in the Womb hath all the Integral parts of a man; and yet ſo ſmall that you cannot ſo eaſily diſcern them as you may do the ſame parts when he is grown up to manhood. So the knowledge of every particular Eſſential Article of faith is truly in the weakeſt Chriſtian in the very moment of his converſion; but perhaps it may be but by a more crude imperfect Conception, that obſerveth not every Article diſtinctly, nor any of them very clearly, but his knowledge is both too dim and too confuſed. And yet I muſt ſay that it is not only ſuch as ſome Papiſts call a Virtual or Implicite Faith or knowledge, As to believe only the General Revelation and the formal Object; as that the Scripture is Gods Word, and God is true: or that whatever the Church propounds as an Article of faith is true; while they know not what the Church or Scripture doth propound: for this is not actual Chriſtian faith, but ſuch a part as a man may have that is no Chriſtian. And yet ſome Papiſts would perſwade us that where this much is, there is ſaving faith, though the perſon believe not (yea, or deny by the probable Doctrine of ſeducing Doctors) ſome of the foreſaid Eſſential Articles.

Argum. 11. If the terms [*Faith in Chriſt, receiving Chriſt, Reſting on Chriſt,* &c.] are to be underſtood as *Civil, Political and Ethical terms* in a moral ſenſe, then muſt we ſuppoſe that they ſignifie many Phyſical acts, and not any one only. But theſe terms are to be thus morally underſtood. *Ergo.*—— The Antecedent is proved thus. Terms are to be underſtood according to the nature of the Subject and Doctrine: But the Subject and Doctrine of the Goſpel which uſeth theſe terms, is Moral Political: therefore the terms are agreeably to be interpreted. The ſame term in Phyſick, Law, Mathematicks, Soldiery, Navigation, Husbandry, *&c.* hath various ſignifications: but ſtill it muſt be interpreted according to the nature and uſe of the doctrine, Art or Science that maketh uſe of it. The conſequence of the Major is proved, becauſe it is the uſe of Ethicks and Politicks thus to interpret ſuch phraſes as

containing divers Physical Acts. Marriage is one Civil act; but it is many Physical Acts: it containeth divers acts of the understanding concerning the Essentials of the Relation: and divers acts of the Will in consenting thereunto; and the outward words or signs of Consent, for making the Contract. So taking a man to be my King, my General, my Tutor, Teacher, Pastor, Physician, Master, &c. all signifie the acts of the Understanding, Will and expressing Powers, which the several parts of the Objects do require.

Argument 12. If there be many Acts *besides Faith in Christ, attendant* on it, and *subservient* to it, which are none of the works which *Paul* excludeth, and opposeth faith to; then the Essential Acts of faith it self are none of those works. But the Antecedent is true, as I prove in some instances:

For a man to repent of sin, to confess it, to believe and confess that we are unworthy of any Mercy, and unable to justifie our selves, or make satisfaction for our sins, and that we are in absolute necessity of Christ, having no Righteousness, Sanctification or Sufficiency of our own, to take God for our Father reconciled in Christ, and to Love him accordingly: to forgive our Brethren from the sense of Christs forgiving us: to shew our Faith by fruitfull works and words. When *Paul* saith, *Rom.* 4.4,5. [*To him that worketh the Reward is not of Grace*] the meaning is not [*To him that repenteth, to him that denieth himself and his own Righteousness to his Justification, to him that confesseth his sin, that loveth God as a reconciled Father in Christ, &c,*] and when he saith, [*To him that worketh not, but believeth*] the meaning is not [*to him that loveth not God, to him that repenteth not, that forgiveth not others,* &c. *but believeth.*

Object. *But yet it may be* [*to him that thinketh not to be justified by or for these, but by Faith.*] Answer 1. Concomitants and Subordinates may not be set in opposition, faith supposeth the Concomitancy anb Subserviency of these in and to Justification

fication. 2. Believing in Christs Ransom, may as well be excluded too, if men think to be justified for so doing meritoriously. 3. He that thinketh to be justified by any work in that way which is opposed to Justification by Grace and Faith, must think to be justified by the Merit of them, or without a Saviour, which all these Graces forementioned contradict. 4. God saith expressly, that we must [*Repent and be converted, that our sins may be blotted out: and repent that we may be forgiven: and if we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive us our sins: and if we forgive, we shall be forgiven; and that by works we are justified and not by faith only: and that by our words we shall be justified*: So that *Pauls* works which he opposeth faith to, are neither *Jame's works*, nor any of these particulars mentioned: for these are made necessary conditions or means of pardon, and of some sort of Justification, such as *Pauls* works could not contribute to, which were falsly imagined by the doers to make the Reward to be not of Grace but Debt.

Object. *There is but one faith*, *Eph.* 4.3. Answer. But that *One* faith hath many Physical Acts or Articles. There is but one true Religion, but it hath many parts. There is but one Gospel, but that one contanieth many particular Truths.

Conſect. 1. To be *juſtified by Faith*, is to be juſtified by *Faith in Chriſt as Chriſt*, and not by any one part of that Faith, excluding any of its Eſſential parts.

2. To be juſtified by Faith in Chriſt as *Chriſt*, and ſo as Riſing, Teaching, Pardoning, Ruling, Judging, as well as ſatisfying, *i.e.* as the Saviour that hath undertaken all this, is not in *Pauls* ſenſe to be juſtified by works: therefore it is the true Juſtification by Faith.

3. It is therefore unſound to make any one Act or part of Faith the *fides qua Juſtificans*, and the other Eſſential parts to be the *fides quæ juſtificat*, when no more can be ſaid of any but that it is *fides ex qua juſtificamur*, and that may be ſaid of all.

4. Though Faith be an Acceptance of Chriſt and Life as offered in the Goſpel, ſo that its very Nature or Eſſence is morally Receptive, which may tolerably be called its Metaphorical Paſſive Inſtrumentality; yet are we not juſtified by it *qua talis*, that is, *qua fides*, and ſo not *quatenus Inſtrumentum tale Metaphoricum, vel Acceptatio, vel Receptio moralis*, but *qua conditio Teſtamenti vel fœderis præſtita.*

5. There-

5. Therefore it is not only the Acceptance of Righteousnes by which we are justified, much les the Affiance in Christ as dying only; but the Belief in Christ as the Purchaser of Salvation, and as the Sanctifier, Guide and Teacher of our souls in order thereunto, hath as true an Interest in our Justification as the believing in him for Pardon. And so far as any other holy act doth modifie and subserve faith, and is part of the Condition of Justification with it, so far by it also we are justified.

FINIS